

## CONTENTS

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <i>Frontispiece</i> .....   | i   |
| Vajrapāṇi in India (II) – <i>Étienne Lamotte</i> .....  | 119 |
| The Status of Monks: State Regulations concerning Buddhist<br>Monks in the Koryō Dynasty – <i>Sem Vermeersch</i> .....  | 145 |
| The Pārājika Precepts for Nuns – <i>Ann Heirman</i> .....   | 169 |
| “Regret” – Contemporary Sri Lankan Sanskrit Poetry:<br><i>Paścātāpaḥ</i> by Davuldeṇa Jñāneśvara – ed. & tr. <i>Bhikkhu<br/>Tampalawela Dhammaratana and Bhikkhu Pāsādika</i> ... | 183 |
| The Great Perfection and the Chinese Monk: rNying-ma-pa<br>Defences of Hwa-Shang Mahāyāna in the Eighteenth<br>Century – <i>Sam van Schaik</i> .....                              | 189 |
| Ekottarāgama (XXXII) – tr. <i>Thích Huyền-Vi and Bhikkhu<br/>Pāsādika</i> .....   | 205 |
| Book Reviews .....  | 211 |

ISSN 0265-2897

© 2003 *Buddhist Studies Review*

=====

*Buddhist Studies Review* is the semi-annual journal of the UK Association for Buddhist Studies and is sponsored by the Institut de recherche bouddhique Linh-Sơn

*Editor and Chairman, Editorial Board:* Russell Webb  
*Assistant Editors:* Bhikkhu Pāsādika Sara Boin-Webb  
*Board Members:* T. H. Barrett Cathy Cantwell  
 Rupert Gethin Ulrich Pagel  
 Andrew Skilton

*North American Representative:* Charles S. Prebish

*Spiritual Advisor:* Ven Thích Huyền-Vi

For editorial addresses/subscription details, see inside back cover

蹤如 是空 亦及  
 跡鳥 彼無 平等  
 不遊 所相 貪諸  
 可虛 行解 飲漏  
 得空 境脫 食盡



Frontispiece: the calligraphy in seal  
script by Shi Weimiao, translated into  
Chinese by Shi Liaocan, reads:

*Whose āsavas are destroyed, and who  
is not dependent upon food, whose realm  
is empty and unconditioned release,  
his track is hard to follow,  
like that of birds in the sky.*

Dhammapada VII, v.93 (tr. K.R. Norman)  
© 1997 Pali Text Society

## VAJRAPĀṆI IN INDIA

ÉTIENNE LAMOTTE

### II

#### IV . VAJRAPĀṆI, BODHISATTVA AND ETERNAL ESCORT

The arrival of the Mahāyāna at the beginning of the Common Era marks a turning point in the legend of Vajrapāṇi. In consideration of his previous good services, the compilers of the Vaipulya sūtras raised him to the rank of bodhisattva, dedicated to the welfare and happiness of all beings and destined one day to attain supreme and perfect enlightenment. Furthermore, they proclaimed him the eternal escort (*satatasamitam anubaddha*) of the Buddha. Let us briefly examine these two qualities.

##### 1. *Vajrapāṇi, bodhisattva*

The early canonical sūtras regularly begin with an introduction (*nidāna*) serving to state the circumstances of place and persons. The Buddha is usually in a town in central India, surrounded by an assembly of bhikṣus who listen to him; this assembly, formed of a limited number of Listeners (*śrāvaka*), is sometimes augmented by some gods and demi-gods with whom the Buddha enters into conversation. The Mahāyāna sūtras, also called sūtras with long developments [*vaipulya*], adopt an identical setting, with the minor difference that they exaggerate the numbers of listeners (bhikṣus, bhikṣuṇīs, upasākas, upasikās, devas and asuras of all orders) and that they juxtapose with them a crowd of bodhisattvas with innumerable qualities and complicated names.

With the exception of the future Buddha Maitreya, common to both Vehicles, the names of these bodhisattvas were completely unknown to the early sources. In contrast, the śrāvakas, devas and asuras mentioned in the Mahāyāna sūtras were familiar to them.

The Mahāyāna attached particular importance to hybrid beings, nāgas, yakṣas, gandharvas, asuras, garuḍas, kinnaras and mahoragas which, without truly being animal, man or god, resembled them in certain respects. Since it is difficult to place them in any of the five traditional destinies (*gati*), certain scholars

classified them in a 'sixth *gati*', that of the asuras.<sup>102</sup>

The asuras are wicked and belligerent by nature, but the goodwill of the Buddha was manifested towards them: some of them were converted, cultivated merit and embraced the precepts. The Mahāyāna did not hesitate to make them bodhisattvas. Amongst these we note, with the *Upadeśa* of Nāgārjuna, the nāgarāṣ Anavatapta,<sup>103</sup> – a bodhisattva of the seventh stage – and Sigara,<sup>104</sup> the yakṣiṇī Mother of Uttarikā and Punarvasu<sup>105</sup> and Hārītī, mother of demons,<sup>106</sup> Druma the king of the kimnaras and gandharvas,<sup>107</sup> Vemacitra asurinda,<sup>108</sup> finally and especially the yakṣa Guhyaka Vajrapāṇi, the Malla, 'who prevails over all the bodhisattvas and, all the more so, over all mankind'.<sup>109</sup>

This is not simply a view peculiar to the *Upadeśa*: the elevation of Vajrapāṇi to the rank of great bodhisattva is attested in the oldest Mahāyāna sūtras.<sup>110</sup>

The *Avatamsaka* was translated for the first time by Buddhaghosa in Nanking, from 418 to 420, from a Sanskrit version in 36,000 *gāthās* discovered in Khotan by Fa-ling between 392 and 408. The assembly to whom this sūtra was expounded included an infinite number of Vajrapāṇis endowed with all the qualities of the great bodhisattvas.<sup>111</sup>

<sup>102</sup> Cf. *Upadeśa*, T 1509, ch.10, p.135c (tr. in *Traité I*, pp.613-16); *Hōbōgirin*, p.42, s.v. *Ashura*; P. Mus, *La lumière sur les Six Voies*, Paris 1939, pp.155, 175; A. Bareau, *Les sectes bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule*, Paris/Saigon 1955, p.280.

<sup>103</sup> T 1509, ch.7, p.114a16-17; ch.39, p.344a28.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, ch.39, p.344a27.

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, ch.10, p.125c8-13.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, ch.39, p.344a28-29.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, ch.10, p.135c15-17; ch.11, p.139b21-27; ch.17, p.188b9-15.

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*, ch.10, p.135b24-26; ch.25, p.242c24.

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, ch.10, p.135c14; ch.39, p.344a28.

<sup>110</sup> There are nonetheless late Mahāyāna sūtras which still maintain Vajrapāṇi in the rank of yakṣa. It is as such that he appears in the list of deities assisting the kings of the earth who protect the teaching of the *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra* (ed. J. Nobel, pp.83,3; 91,17). These deities are the Four Mahārājas, Brahmā Sahāṃpati, Śakra devendra, the goddesses Saravatī, Dṛḍhā and Śrī, the mahā-yakṣasenāpati Saṃjīñāya, Vajrapāṇi and Māṇibhadra, the devaputra Maheśvara, Hārītī, and the mahānāgarāṣas Anavatapta and Sāgara.

<sup>111</sup> *Avatamsaka* (tr. by Śikṣānanda between 694 and 699), T 279, ch.1, p.2b13-

There were there Vajrapāṇi yakṣas as numerous as the fine dust-motes of the Buddhakṣetra, namely the Vajrapāṇis Suvarṇanārāyana, Sūryavegadhvaja, Sumerupuṣpaprabha, Viśuddhameghasvara, Indriyaprabhūta, Manojñavajraprabha, Nandanaprabhāsa, Vṛkṣanirghoṣa, Simhaprabharāja, Arcirghanaśrīnetra, Padmaprabhāmaṇicūḍa, etc. For innumerable kalpas in the past they had made the great aspiration (*praṇidhāna*) to serve and honour the Buddhas always and, acting in conformity with this wish, they had acquired the fulfilment of the perfections (*pāramitā-paripūrī*). They had accumulated an infinite quantity of pure and meritorious actions. They had penetrated the domain of all the concentrations (*samādhi-gocara*). They possessed the superknowledges (*abhijñā*), the powers (*bala*) and the abodes of the Buddhas (*tathāgatavihāra*). They had entered the sphere of inconceivable liberations (*acintyavimokṣa*). In the midst of all the assemblies, they were notable for their majestic radiance. They assumed bodies perfectly adapted to the needs of beings to be converted and could thus win them over. They conformed their transformations to the *nirmāṇakāyas* of the Buddhas. They always endeavoured to protect the dwelling-places of all the Tathāgatas.

The Mahāyāna sūtras set themselves the task of informing us about the two crucial moments in the career of the great bodhisattvas: 1. the arousal of the thought of enlightenment (*bodhi-cittotpāda*); 2. the acquisition of supreme and perfect enlightenment (*anuttarasamyak sambodhipratilābha*) marking the arrival at Buddhahood. Innumerable incalculable periods ago the bhikṣu Dharmakāra aroused the thought of *bodhi* in the presence of the Buddha Lokeśvararāja and determined by his aspirations (*praṇidhāna*) the qualities with which he intended adorning his Buddha-field (*buddhakṣetra*); it took him an hundred thousand *nayuta-kotīs* of years finally to reach supreme and perfect enlightenment and, at present, he is the Buddha Amitābha ruling over the Sukhāvātī universe.

Innumerable incalculable periods ago, in the Anutpādā, or Bhadrōtpādā, universe, in the presence of the Buddha Meghasvaraghoṣa, King Ākāśa aroused the thought of *bodhi* and made his aspirations; he is at present the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī; at the end of time, when all beings have been won over, he will be the



Buddha Samantadarśin ruling over the Vimālā universe.<sup>112</sup>

With regard to Vajrapāṇi, similar information is given to us by the *Tathāgataguhyaka* or *Tathāgatācintyaguhyanirdeśa*, an old Mahāyāna sūtra of which three translations exist: 1. a Chinese translation made by Dharmarakṣa of the Western Chin and completed on 16 November 280; at the beginning of the eighth century (706-713) Bodhiruci, alias Dharmaruci, incorporated it just as it was into his compilation of the *Ratnakūṭa* (T 310, ch.8-14, pp.42-80); 2. a Tibetan translation made in the first quarter of the ninth century by Jinamitra and his team (OKC, No.760, 3); 3. a new Chinese translation made in the eleventh century by Dharmarakṣa of the Sung (T 312).

In this text Vajrapāṇi is, along with Brahmā Śikhin, one of the heroes of a long jātakā devoted to a former existence of the thousand Buddhas of the present Auspicious Period (*bhadra-kalpa*), a thousand Buddhas of whom four (Krakucchanda, Kana-kamuni, Kāśyapa and Sākyamuni<sup>113</sup>) have already appeared, the other 996 being yet to come.

There are notable divergences between the three versions of the jātakā which have come down to us and I will merely give a summary of it here.<sup>114</sup>

In the assembly some bodhisattvas were wondering before which Buddha of the past Vajrapāṇi had planted the good roots which today enabled him to make such generous aspirations and expound the Dharma so eloquently. The Buddha, reading their minds, explained to the Bodhisattva Śāntamati:

In the remotest of times, during the Sudarśana kalpa, the Buddha Anantaḡaṇanāratnavyūha (abbr. Anantaḡaṇa) appeared in the Vibhūṣaṇā universe, a marvellous universe inhabited by particularly good and virtuous beings. An assembly of twelve *navutas* of śrāvakas and thirty-two *koṭis* of bodhisattvas surrounded

that Buddha.

The Vibhūṣaṇā universe contained a world of four continents (*caturdvīpaka*) having as its capital the town of Viśuddha, 64 leagues long by 42 wide. The town contained a palace (*prāsāda*) sixteen leagues along the side, surrounded by seven walls and enclosing four parks (*udyaṇa*) respectively called Nānāpuṣpa, Guṇābhinandin, Māyūrābhinandin and Kālasukha. Each of those parks contained four pools (*puṣkariṇī*) called Nanda, Nandāgra, Gandhāgra and Niṣyanda.

At that time the palace was occupied by the cakravartin king Dhṛtarāṣṭra, ruling over the four continents and possessed of the seven jewels. He was irreversible (*avaivartika*) on the path to supreme and perfect enlightenment. His 70,000 women and 1,000 sons were committed (*saṃprasthita*) to the same path, and the princes further possessed twenty-eight Marks of a Great Man (*mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇa*).

One day, the Buddha Anantaḡaṇa settled in Viśuddha. The king showered the Master and his community with gifts and offerings. The thousand princes showed themselves to be particularly zealous and, once in possession of the five *abhijñās*, they rose into the air and went from park to park, town to town and borough to borough, inviting the population to go to the Buddha in order to hear him expound the Dharma. The earth quaked, the gods gave cries of joy and scattered flowers. Enormous crowds came to bow down at the feet of the Buddha who performed innumerable conversions: some committed themselves to *bodhi*, others renounced the world and took up the religious life, yet others entered the lay confraternity.

Meanwhile, the thousand princes, in order to honour their father, had built for him a pavilion (*kūṭāgāra*) out of sandalwood, unforgettably luxurious. The king decided to use it to pay a visit to the Buddha. The pavilion was laden with offerings and gifts; the king and the whole court took their places in it; the pavilion, like the swan-king, rose into the air and, in a few seconds, landed at the feet of the Buddha. Everyone descended and stood to one side. On seeing the faith of those visitors, the Buddha addressed them with a series of instructions each consisting of four points according to the method of propounding used in the *Ratnakūṭa*: 'If he possesses four dharmas, he who is committed to the Great Vehicle (*mahāyāna-saṃprasthita*) avoids all lapsing in the march of progress (*aparīhāṇadharmā bhavati viśeṣagāmitāyā*). Which are those four? Faith (*prāsāda*), respect (*gaurāva*), absence of pride (*amāna*) and vigour (*virya*)', etc. Edified and delighted by that teaching, the king offered

<sup>112</sup> On the *cittotpāda* of Amitābha and Mañjuśrī, cf. É Lamotte, 'Mañjuśrī' in *T'oung Pao* XLVIII, 1960, pp.17-23.

<sup>113</sup> See a jātakā devoted to the same subject in Lamotte (tr. Boin), *The Teaching of Vimalakīrti*, PTS, London 1976, Oxford 1994, pp.255-67.

<sup>114</sup> This summary is mainly based on the translation of the *Tathāgatācintyaguhyanirdeśa* by Dharmarakṣa of the Sung, T 312, ch.4, pp.712c-716a. For other translations, see T 310, ch.9, pp.49a-53a; Tib. Trip., Vol.22, pp.56-9, fol.135a-143a.

the Buddha a necklet of pearls of inestimable value and dedicated all the riches of the kingdom to him; furthermore, he committed himself to observe temporary continence and the five precepts imposed upon the laity until the end of his life. The king's women covered the Buddha with their raiment and ornaments; they undertook the same commitments as the king and aroused the thought of *bodhi*. Having greeted the Buddha, the court resumed its place in the pavilion and, flying through the air, regained the town of Viśuddha.

Some time afterwards, on a full-moon day, King Dhṛtarāṣṭra and his women went to the Nānāpuṣpa park to devote themselves to pleasure. Then the two queens Aninditā and Anupamā went to bathe in the Nanda pool. In order to dry themselves they sat on lotuses (*padma*) by way of thrones (*siṃhāsana*). On each of the two thrones there miraculously appeared a child, of fine appearance, gracious, amiable to behold, seated cross-legged. From the height of the sky the gods cried: 'This child is Dharmacetana, that child is Dharmamati', and it was therefore this that they were called in the world. Dharmacetana was born miraculously on the seat of Queen Aninditā, and Dharmamati on that of Queen Anupamā.

As soon as they were born, the two children, sitting cross-legged in the air, uttered stanzas. They had come, they said, from the Aninditāṅga universe ruled over by the Buddha Kālāṅga; if they had chosen Dhṛtarāṣṭra as their father and the two queens as their mothers, it was with the sole aim of going to revere and hear the Buddha Anantaṅga.

Immediately King Dhṛtarāṣṭra, the queens and the two children, using the power of the *abhijñās*, went through the air to the Buddha Anantaṅga. The latter, recognising true bodhisattvas in the persons of the two children, expounded the most profound Saddharma to them: 'Among dharmas arising from causes, none is autonomous, none is active; inwardly they are empty, outwardly they are inactive. All dharmas are empty, false and unreal'. Once the Buddha had thus expounded the pure Dharma to them in every way, 76 *nayutas* and 3 *koṭis* of beings obtained the *anutpattikadharmakṣānti*. Dhṛtarāṣṭra revered the Buddha for seven days and seven nights, then, still followed by his retinue, regained his palace.

Alone in his sandalwood pavilion, he collected himself and wondered: My thousand sons, he said, are all solidly settled on supreme and perfect enlightenment; but I would like to know who will be the first to attain the fruit and win Buddhahood. Having reflected thus, he had an urn (*gola*) made of the seven jewels, had

the names of his thousand sons written down, inserted them in the urn, placed everything on a precious lotus made of the seven jewels and, for seven days and seven nights, honoured in every way the names contained in the urn. Ten thousand devas associated themselves with his homages. Finally, in the presence of his women, his thousand sons and two children, the king placed the urn on a golden litter (*suvarṇamayapīṭhikā*) and ordered a servant to withdraw the names one by one. The name which came out first was that of Prince Viśuddhamati. Immediately, the great earth quaked in six ways and the musical instruments from the women's apartments began to play by themselves, without being plucked.

The princes Viśuddhamati, Vijayasena and Śāntendriya, whose names came out first, will be the three Buddhas-of-the-past of the present Bhadrakalpa, namely, Krakucchanda, Kanakamuni and Kāśyapa. Prince Sarvasiddhārtha will be the present Buddha Śākyamuni. Then follow the names of the seventeen princes who will be the first seventeen Buddhas-of-the-future in the present Bhadrakalpa, namely, Maitreya, Siṃha, Mahādhvaja, Kusuma, Punar apī Kusuma, Sunakṣatra, Sunetra, Subāhu, Pradyota, Muktika, Sārthavāha, Guṇāgradhārin, Sudhana, Jñānākara, Ratnākara, Samantatejas and Anantaṅgakīrti [slightly different list from that which appears in the polyglot edition by F. Weller under the title *Tausend Buddhanamen des Bhadrakalpa*, Leipzig 1928].

The thousandth and last name to come out of the urn was that of Prince Anantamati. His older brothers mocked him and asked him: When we will have done Buddha deeds and converted beings, what will remain for you to do? – Anantamati responded by committing himself to live as long as all his brothers together and to win a band of disciples (*śrāvakaśaṃgha*) equal in number to those of all his brothers together. In conformity with this good purpose (*ruci*), he will be the Buddha Roca, last future-Buddha of the present Bhadrakalpa.

Then the thousand princes asked the two bodhisattva-children what aspirations (*praṇidhāna*) they had. Dharmacetana answered: 'Friends, I wish to be Vajrapāṇi for you all and, dwelling among you, never to be isolated from the secrets (*guhya*) of the Tathāgatas, to hear, accept and understand all the esoteric and exoteric teachings of the Buddhas (*ādhyaṭmika-bāhyabuddhadharma*)'. As for Dharmamati, he declared: 'Consanguinous (*salohita*) brothers, when you have attained *bodhi*, I will incite you to set turning the Wheel of the Dharma, and I wish that you may set it turning on my instigation'. Then the Buddha Anantaṅga predicted to the two children that it



would be as they desired.

Having concluded that story, the Buddha Śākyamuni further provided the bodhisattva Śāntamati with the following details:

The cakravartin Dhṛtarāṣṭra of that time was, later, the Bhagavat Dipaṃkara. The thousand sons that he had then are the thousand Buddhas of the present Bhadrakalpa. The young Dharmacetana born on the lotus of Queen Aninditā is the present Guhyādhīpati Vajrapāṇi. The young Dharmamati, born on the lotus of Queen Anupamā is the present Brahmā Sikhin. The women who then formed the king's retinue are now bodhisattvas participating in the assembly of the *Tathāgataguhyakasūtra*. Finally, the beings whom the princes had converted and who, at that time, were committed to the Mahāyāna, will now receive, during the Bhadrakalpa, the prediction (*vyākaraṇa*) concerning their arrival at *bodhi*.

What is most curious is to see the humble yakṣa placed on the same footing as the great god Brahmā, but we are not told either when or how he will one day attain supreme enlightenment.

## 2. Vajrapāṇi, eternal escort of the Buddha

From the outset, Buddhists have been interested in the attendants (*upasthāyaka*, Pāli *upatthāka*) of the Buddhas, monks especially attached to the person of the Master, charged with fanning him, carrying his cloak and alms-bowl, introducing visitors, etc. The *Mahāvadānasūtra*<sup>115</sup> has drawn up a list of the attendants who served the last seven Buddhas: Aśoka for Vipāśyin, Kṣemakāra for Sikhin, Upaśānta for Viśvabhūj, Bhadrīka for Krakasunda (or Krakucchanda), Svastika for Kanakamuni, Sarvamitra for Kāśyapa and, finally, Ānanda for Śākyamuni.

The circumstances in which the last chose Ānanda are known: in the twentieth year of his public ministry the Buddha, aware of age coming on, felt the need for a servant who would be attached to him at home and named Ānanda as his attendant. Before accepting this responsibility, the disciple set certain conditions on it, particularly never to have to share the Buddha's food and clothing, not to have to accompany him on visits to the laity and to have access to the Master at all times of the day.<sup>116</sup> Ānanda

fulfilled his mission with the greatest devotion for the last twenty-five years of the Buddha's life.<sup>117</sup>

However, before Ānanda took charge, other disciples undertook the function on an occasional and purely temporary basis. The Theragāthā Commentary<sup>118</sup> notes seven of them, and its assertion can be vouchsafed by earlier canonical sources: 1. Nāgasamāla (cf. *Majjhima* I, p.98,19); 2. Nāgita (*Dīgha* I, p.151,8); 3. Upavāna (*Dīgha* II, p.139,1; *Saṃyutta* I, p.174,25); 4. Sunakkhatta (*Jātaka* I, p.389,16); 5. Cūṇḍa the novice (*Saṃyutta* V, p.161,23); 6. Sāgata (Vin. I, p.179,26); 7. Meghiya (*Udāna*, p.34,4).

For its part, the *Vinayamātrkā* of the Haimavatas<sup>119</sup> knows of eight who, 'fan in hand, fanned the Buddha'. They were: 1. Kāśyapa; 2. Kāludāyin; 3. Sāgata; 4. Meghiya; 5. Nāgasamāla; 6. [Mahā]cūṇḍa; 7. Sunakṣatra; 8. Ānanda.

The Mahāyānists also showed interest in the Buddha's attendants, but they enlarged the list of them. We have seen how the *nidānas* which introduce their Vaipulya sūtras had already juxtaposed a bodhisattvasaṃgha with the traditional śrāvaka-saṃgha. Here again, they thought it advisable to introduce some bodhisattvas among the Buddha's attendants. They attributed a twofold entourage to the Master: the intimate entourage (*abhyantaraparivāra*) and the wider entourage (*mahāparivāra*). The bodhisattva Vajrapāṇi was purportedly part of the former with Ānanda and other attendants of the Buddha; the bodhisattvas Maitreya, Mañjuśrī, Bhadrakālā, etc., pertained to the latter along with the majority of Śākyamuni's disciples.

We read in the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*: 'O, Subhūti, the bodhisattva mahāsattva who wishes to be the attendant (*upasthāyaka*) of the Beneficent Lord Buddhas, who wishes to be part of their intimate entourage (*abhyantaraparivāra*), who wishes to obtain for himself a wider entourage (*mahāparivāra*)

*ch'u ching*, T 730, p.526a-b; *Vinayavibhāṣā*, T 1440, ch.1, p.504c12-15; *Manorathapūraṇī* I, pp.292-6; Theragāthā Comm. in *Psalm of the Brethren*, London 1937, pp.350-2; Sanskrit *Mahāvadānasūtra*, p.78; *Divyāvadāna*, p.612,2.

<sup>117</sup> The last twenty-five years, in *Dirgha*, T 1, ch.3, p.19c; T 5, ch.2, p.169a15; *Upadeśa*, T 1509, ch.2, p.68a10; twenty years and more, in the Northern *Mahāparinirvāṇa*, T 374, ch.40, p.601b26.

<sup>118</sup> C. Rhys Davids, *Psalm of the Brethren*, p.350.

<sup>119</sup> *P'i ni mu ching*, T 1463, ch.5, p.827c12-14.

<sup>115</sup> Ed. E. Waldschmidt, Anhang, p.172.

<sup>116</sup> Cf. *Upasthāyakasūtra* in Madhyama, T 26, ch.8, pp.471c-475a; Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya in W.W. Rockhill, *Life of the Buddha*, London 1884, p.88; *Fo pao ên ching*, T 156, ch.6, p.155c22-25; *Hsien yü ching*, T 202, ch.8, p.404b-c; *Ch'u*



and who wishes to obtain an entourage of bodhisattvas, should train in the Prajñāparamitā'.<sup>120</sup>

This is how the *Upadeśa*<sup>121</sup> comments on this passage:

'Being the attendant of the Buddha'. – Thus, when the Buddha Śākyamuni had still not renounced the world (*pravrajita*), he had Chandaka as his attendant (*upasthāyaka*) and Kāludāyin as his play-fellow;<sup>122</sup> his wives Gopiyā, Yaśodharā, etc., formed his intimate entourage (*abhyantaraparivāra*).<sup>123</sup> – Once he had taken up the homeless life, for six years of austerity (*duṣkaracaryā*), he had the group of five (*pañcavarga*) as attendants (*upasthāyaka*).<sup>124</sup> – After he had won enlightenment (*abhisambuddha*), Meghiya, Rādhā, Sunakṣatra, Ānanda, Guhyaka the Malla, etc., formed his intimate entourage (*abhyantaraparivāra*).<sup>125</sup>

'Obtaining a wider entourage'. – The holy Śāriputra, Maudgalyāyana, Mahākāśyapa, Subhūti, Kātyāyana, Pūrṇa[maitrāyaṇi]putra, Aniruddha, etc., as well as Maitreya, Mañjuśrī, Bhadrāpāla, etc., irreversible (*avaivartika*) bodhisattvas separated from Buddhahood by only one existence (*ekajātīpratibaddha*), were named his wider entourage (*mahāparivāra*).

Moreover, the Buddha has two kinds of body: Body born of the suchness of phenomena (*dharmatājākāya*) and body conforming to the world (*lokānuvartanakāya*). The worldly body (*laukikakāya*) is the entourage just mentioned. As for the body born of the suchness of phenomena, it has as attendants (*upasthāyaka*) innumerable (*apramāṇa*) and incalculable (*asamkhyeya*) *ekajātīpratibaddha* bodhisattvas. How is that so? It is said in the *Acintyavimokṣasūtra*<sup>126</sup> that, when the Buddha was born, 84,000 *ekajātīpratibaddha* bodhisattvas were present: bodhisattvas were born in his wake like dark clouds caging in the moon. Moreover, it is said in the *Saddharma-puṇḍarikāsūtra* that the bodhisattvas who emerged from the ground

all had an intimate entourage (*abhyantaraparivāra*) and a wider entourage (*mahāparivāra*).<sup>127</sup>

'Obtaining an entourage of bodhisattvas'. – There are Buddhas who are surrounded only by bodhisattvas; there are Buddhas who are surrounded only by śrāvakas; there are Buddhas who are surrounded by both bodhisattvas and śrāvakas. That is why the text merely says that the bodhisattva 'who wishes to obtain an entourage of bodhisattvas should train in the Prajñāpāramitā'. There are three kinds of entourage (*parivāra*): higher, middling or lesser. The lesser consists only of śrāvakas, the middling consists of a mixture [of śrāvakas and bodhisattvas]; the higher consists only of bodhisattvas.

It appears from these explanations that the Mahāyāna attributes a twofold entourage to the worldly body of the Buddha Śākyamuni: 1. an intimate entourage formed of some eight *upasthāyakas* specially designated to that function, and the *bodhisattva Vajrapāṇi Guhyaka*; 2. a wider entourage containing a mass of śrāvakas and a whole series of great bodhisattvas.

Of all the śrāvakas who succeeded each other in the service of the Buddha, Ānanda was by far the most important since he remained attached to the Master's person for twenty-five years. No less than five pre-eminences are attributed to him;<sup>128</sup> he was the foremost of the learned (*bahuśrūta*) and memorisers (*smṛti-mat*). These qualities made his presence indispensable to the First Council of Rājagṛha and, despite Mahākāśyapa's reservations, it was he who recited the whole Basket of Sūtras. Even while asserting the superiority of bodhisattvas over śrāvakas,<sup>129</sup> the Mahāyānists in no way dreamed of diminishing Ānanda's prestige and, along with the other great śrāvakas such as Śāriputra and

<sup>120</sup> T 223, ch.1, p.220b7-9, the Chinese translation differs slightly from the original Sanskrit of the *Pañcaviṃśati* ed. N. Dutt, London 1934, p.29,10-13.

<sup>121</sup> T 1509, ch.33, p.303b13-c4.

<sup>122</sup> Cf. *Mahāvastu* III, p.91,7-9; *Jātaka* I, p.86,14-15.

<sup>123</sup> Cf. Nāgārjuna, *Traité* II, p.1011 ff.

<sup>124</sup> Cf. *Jātaka* I, p.67,4: *Koṇḍaññaṇapamukhā pañca pabbajitā*.

<sup>125</sup> The same *Upadeśa*, T 1509, ch.26, p.252c16-17, mentions Rādhā, Meghika, Sunakṣatra, Nāgasamāla, Ānanda, etc., as attendants.

<sup>126</sup> By *Acintyavimokṣasūtra*, the *Upadeśa* always means the *Avataṃsaka*; cf. *Vimalakīrtinīrdeśa*, Engl. trans., p.141, n.11.

<sup>127</sup> In Ch. XIV of the *Saddharma-puṇḍarika*, an infinite number of bodhisattvas emerge from all the fissures in the Sahāloka. The text (ed. Kern-Nanjio, p.298, 4-5) states that each of them had a retinue of thousands of bodhisattvas: *yeṣāṃ ekaiko bodhisattvaḥ ṣaṣṭigaṇānādvālukopamabodhisattvaparivāro gaṇī mahāgaṇī gaṇācāryaḥ*.

<sup>128</sup> *Aṅguttara* I, pp.24-5.

<sup>129</sup> Hence Ānanda is the foremost of the learned among all the other śrāvakas, but the bodhisattvas' learning is infinitely superior; cf. *Śūraṅgamasamādhi-sūtra*, T 642, ch.2, pp.641c16-64-642a1 (tr. in Lamotte, *Śūraṅgamasamādhi-sūtra, The Concentration of Heroic Progress*, Engl. version by S. Boin-Webb, Richmond, Surrey/London 1998, pp.208-11).

Subhūti,<sup>130</sup> Ānanda holds a strong position in the Mahāyāna sūtras. It is usually to him that Śākyamuni entrusts their transmission (*parīdanā*) and, before accepting that responsibility, Ānanda never fails to enquire as to the exact title of the sūtra concerned.<sup>131</sup>

However, while continuing to refer to Ānanda, the Mahāyānist juxtaposed him with bodhisattvas, preferably Vajrapāṇi. In Śākyamuni's entourage, Ānanda represents the Theravāda whilst Vajrapāṇi incarnates the Mahāyāna. The fate of the great disciple and the yakṣa-bodhisattva is henceforth linked. A late tradition even claims that Ānanda and Vajrapāṇi, assisted by some other bodhisattvas, compiled the Mahāyānist texts at the Council of Mount Vimalasvabhāva (near Rājagṛha) and together ensured their protection. A passage in the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra* by Haribhadra<sup>132</sup> gives a good summary of the current traditions:

In a chapter of the *Tathāgataguhyanirdeśa*,<sup>133</sup> responsibility is given [to Vajrapāṇi] to protect in every way the doctrinal body [revealed] by the material body of all the Tathāgatas of the Auspicious Period. At the beginning of the *Vajrapāṇyabhiśeka*,<sup>134</sup> the teaching [of that doctrine] is entrusted to him. Finally, in others eloquence of quality was lacking. That is why the Ancient Masters say that it is [Vajrapāṇi], the great thunderbolt-wielder, dwelling in Aḍakāvati<sup>135</sup> and

master of the ten stages who, as a favour to the whole world, recited, by beginning with the words *Evam [mayā śrutam]*, the Prajñāpāramitā sūtras to the group of great bodhisattvas, Maitreya, etc., who consulted him.<sup>136</sup> – However, others think that the noble Ānanda was the compiler [of those sūtras] since, in the present text, in the Chapter on the Transmission, the Prajñāpāramitā is entrusted to him with these words: 'Act so that this Prajñāpāramitā is distributed throughout Jambudvīpa'.<sup>137</sup>

To summarise, for the Mahāyāna Ānanda was the principal attendant (*upasthāyaka*) of the Buddha Śākyamuni and the compiler (*saṃgītikāra*) of the writings of both vehicles; Vajrapāṇi was the permanent escort (*nityam anubaddha*) of the *nirmāṇa-kāyas* of the Buddhas, one of the compilers and the guardian of their *dharmakāyas*.

However, still in the Mahāyāna perspective, there is only a difference in degree between the bodhisattvas and Buddhas who are barely differentiated 'like the new moon from the full moon'. So Vajrapāṇi, the guardian of the Buddhas, also extends his protection to all the bodhisattvas. If, in a great assembly, some

<sup>130</sup> Cf. *Upadeśa*, T 1509, p.136a and c (tr. in *Traité II*, pp.621, 633 ff.).

<sup>131</sup> For example, *Samādhirāja* ed. N. Dutt, p.647,13-15; *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, trans., p.272; *Sarvaṇyāsamuccayasamādhi*, T 382, ch.3, p.1004a19-22; *Ākāśagarbha*, T 405, p.656a28-b5; *Acintyaprabhāsanirdeśa*, T 484, p.673a2-5; *Kuanwu liang shou fo*, T 365, p.346b5-9, and many other texts.

<sup>132</sup> Ed. U. Wogihara, p.5,6-13: *Tathāgataguhyanirdeśādihikāreṇa sarvathā bhādrakalpikasarvathāgatānām rūpakāyasaddharmakāyarakṣāyām kṛtādhi-kāratvād, Vajrapāṇyabhiśekādau pratyarpitāsāsanatvāc, cānyeśām viśeṣa-vacanābhāvād, Aḍakāvatinivāsī daśabhūmiśvaro Mahāvajradharaḥ sarvalokānugrahāya Prajñāpāramitāsaṃgītūṃ pratyadhiṣṭavantaṃ āryaMaitreyādhibodhisattvagaṇam "evam" ityādy āheti Pūrvācāryāḥ. Anye tv atraivā Parīdanā-parivarte "yatheyam Jambudvīpe Prajñāpāramitā pracaṛiṣyati" ityādinā pratyarpīyaprajñāpāramitātvād āryānandaḥ saṃgītikāra iti manyante.*

<sup>133</sup> T 312, ch.19, p.747a22-26.

<sup>134</sup> Otani Kanjur Catalogue, No.130.

<sup>135</sup> The residence of the devarāja Vaiśravaṇa (Kubera), also named Alakā or Ālakamandā; cf. *Dīgha* II, pp.147,2; 170,7; III, p.201,5; *Milinda*, p.2,15; *Cullavamsa*, pp.8,2; 444,10; 451,7; *Suvarṇaprabhāsa*, T 664, ch.6, p.388b2.

<sup>136</sup> According to the Ancient Masters, the Mahāyāna was compiled by bodhisattvas alone or in the main. Cf. *Tarkajvāla*, Mdo XIX, 180a2-4: 'The texts of the Mahāyāna are the Word of the Buddha. The principal compilers were Samantabhadra, Mañjuśrī, Guhyakādhipati [or Vajrapāṇi] and others. The śrāvakas were by no means the principal compilers of our [Mahāyānist] Canon since the latter is not accessible to them'. – This is also the theory of the Tibetan historians Bu-ston (II, p.101) and Tāranātha (p.62): 'The tradition says that, on the mountain called Vimalasvabhāva, to the south of Rājagṛha, in an assembly of a million bodhisattvas, Mañjuśrī recited the Abhidharma; Maitreya, the Vinaya; and Vajrapāṇi, the Sūtras'.

<sup>137</sup> Here Haribhadra is referring to the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, Ch.xxxii, ed. U. Wogihara, p.900,22. According to this new theory, it is Ānanda, assisted or not by bodhisattvas, who compiled the Mahāyāna sūtras. Cf. *Upadeśa*, T1509, ch.15, p.173c1-2: 'When he is on the point of entering Nirvāṇa, the Buddha entrusts the Dharma-body (*dharmakāya*) to the bodhisattva mahāsattva Maitreya, to Kāśyapa, to Ānanda, etc.'. – *Ibid.*, ch.100, p.756b: 'Certain people say that Mahākāśyapa, at the head of the bhikṣus, compiled the Tripiṭaka on Mount Gṛdhrakūṭa and that after the Buddha's decease, the great bodhisattvas Mañjuśrī and Maitreya, Ānanda in tow, compiled the Mahāyāna. Ānanda was fully cognisant with the aspirations and conduct of beings; that is why he did not expound the Mahāyāna to the śrāvakas [with weak faculties]'.



persons are tempted to answer him disrespectfully, 'the bodhisattva frightens and scares them by creating through transformation a Vajrapāṇi or some other noble-looking, very large and very powerful yakṣa'.<sup>138</sup> Once he has entered the eighth stage, the *Acalābhūmi*, the bodhisattva is always followed (*satatānubaddha*) by Vajrapāṇi,<sup>139</sup> and it is the same for the bodhisattva of the tenth stage, dwelling in the Concentration of Heroic Progress.<sup>140</sup>

The *Laṅkāvatāra*<sup>141</sup> insists on specifying that it is the Buddhas transformed by transformation (*nirmītanairmāṇika*) who are accompanied by Vajrapāṇi, and not the original (*maula*) Buddhas. The original Buddhas are beyond measure and cannot be known by śrāvakas or Pratyekabuddhas or Tīrthyas; they dwell in the happiness of the present life (*dṛṣṭadharmasukhavihārin*) and are endowed with 'acquiescence' and 'knowledge' concerning the comprehension of the Truths (*abhisamayadharmañānakṣānti*): that is why Vajrapāṇi does not accompany them. However, the transformation Buddhas (*nirmītabuddha*) do not arise from actions (*na karmaṣṭhāva*); they are not truly Tathāgatas although the Tathāgatas are not apart from them. They benefit beings as a potter does, making use of every kind of combination: they teach the doctrine in which all kinds of characterisations (*lakṣaṇopeta*) appear and not the domain knowable by the noble knowledge of personal intuition (*svapratyātmāryagatigocara*).

#### V. VAJRAPĀṆI, THE ADAMANTINE BEING

Despite the reservations of the *Laṅkāvatāra*, which tries to maintain him in the realm of form, Vajrapāṇi ended by climbing to the summit of metaphysical realities and reaching the rank of Supreme Being. However, he owed this success less to a natural and logical evolution of Buddhist concepts than to a kind of compromise between the declining Buddhism and resurgent Hinduism which took place at the end of the seventh century CE and found its expression in a new vehicle: the Vajrayāna or

#### Diamond Vehicle.

At the time mystical practices, kept separate until then by the Buddhist theoreticians, increased their hold on the religious communities and provoked the blossoming of a new method of salvation. Deliverance is no longer to be sought only in morality (*śīla*), concentration (*śamādhi*) and wisdom (*prajñā*) – the three essential elements of the early Buddhist Path – but also and especially in mystical formulas (*mantra*, *dhāraṇī*, *vidyā*) and evocation rituals (*sādhana*) communicated in secret from master to pupil.

Philosophical and religious concepts were profoundly modified because of this. At the time which concerns us, the great Mahāyāna schools had already defined their positions: the Mādhyamikas (Nāgārjuna, Āryadeva, Buddhapālita, Bhāvaviveka, Candrakīrti, etc.) proclaimed, without always hypostatizing it, Universal Emptiness (*śūnyatā*); the Yogācārins (Asaṅga, Vasubandhu, Dignāga, Sthiramati, Dharmapāla, etc.) posited Mind-Only (*cittamātratā*) in which the subject and object of knowledge were undifferentiated.

The Vajrayānists, whose main spokesmen were Śubhakarasiṃha (637-735), Vajrabodhi (671-741) and Amoghavajra (705-774) merged the Śūnyatā of the Mādhyamikas and the Cittamātratā of the Yogācārins by postulating a Vajra-sattva 'Diamond Being' which combined them closely: 'By *Vajra* is meant Śūnyatā' by *Sattva*, Knowledge and no more; their identity results from the very nature of the *Vajra-sattva*.<sup>142</sup>

The Vajrasattva is the sum of all the qualities of the Buddhas and bodhisattvas: closely linked to wisdom, it is *vajra-sattva* 'diamond being'; filled with the tastes of great knowledge, it is *mahā-sattva* 'great-being'; always activating religious observances, it is *śamaya-sattva* 'observance-being'; associated with practices leading to enlightenment, it is *bodhi-sattva* 'enlightenment-being'; closely linked to knowledge, it is *jñāna-sattva* 'knowledge-being'.<sup>143</sup>

<sup>138</sup> *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, ed. U. Wogihara, p.152,1-2: *Bodhisattvo Vajrapāṇiṃ vā udāra-varṇaṃ mahākāyaṃ mahābalaṃ yakṣaṃ abhinirmimiya bhīṣaty uttrāsayati*.

<sup>139</sup> *Daśabhūmiśvara*, ed. R. Kondō, p.144,5.

<sup>140</sup> *Śūrangamasamādhi*, T 642, ch.1, p.631c17-18 (tr. Lamotte, Engl. version, p.125-6).

<sup>141</sup> Ed. B. Nanjio, p.242,6-15; T 672, ch.6, p.622c7-13 (tr. Suzuki, p.209).

<sup>142</sup> *Advayasamgraha*, in S.B. Dasgupta, *An Introduction to Tantric Buddhism*, Calcutta 1950, p.87, n.2:

*Vajreṇa śūnyata proktā sattvena jñānamātratā, tādātmyam anayoḥ siddhaṃ vajrasattvasvabhāvaṭaḥ.*

<sup>143</sup> Ms RASB 11317, in Dasgupta, *op. cit.*, p.92, n.1:

It is this, and not the Buddhas who succeeded each other in the course of time, that deserves, in the full sense, the title of Beneficent One and Tathāgata: 'Instructor of all the Buddhas and bodhisattvas and all the Tathāgatas, it alone is Bhagavat, the great Thunderbolt-wielder, the sovereign lord of the knowledge of all the Buddhas'.<sup>144</sup> It is 'the single immaculate eye of knowledge, knowledge incarnate, Tathāgata, undivided, omnipresent, immanent, subtle seed, free from defilements'.<sup>145</sup>

Distinct from existence and non-existence (*bhavābhāvavinirmukta*), the Vajrasattva is endowed with everything that is best in the way of modalities (*sarvākāvaropeta*), beautiful in form (*asecanakavigraha*) and supreme happiness (*param sukham*).

This Adamantine Being is separate from the condition of the 'historical' Buddhas who came into the world to indicate the path to Nirvāṇa; it is the same as the *Brahman-ātman* of the Upaniṣads and the Vedānta which the ascetic should find in himself and adore as the supreme deity: 'It is as supreme deity that the ascetic should honour his self',<sup>146</sup> or again, 'The *ātman* is all Buddhahood, all brilliance; it is therefore the *ātman* that one should always honour with all one's efforts'.<sup>147</sup>

A thunderbolt-wielder in the early Buddhist tradition, raised to

*Anayā prajñāyā yuktaṃ vajrasattva iti smṛtaḥ.  
mahājñānārasaiḥ pūrṇo mahāsattvo nigadyate,  
nityam samayaprayatvat samayasattvo vidhiyate.  
bodhicaryāsamāseṇa bodhisattvaṃ nigadyate  
prajñājñānasamāyogāt jñānasattvas tathāgataḥ.*

<sup>144</sup> *Guhyasamājatantra*, ed. B. Bhattacharyya, p.138,19-20: *Śāstā sarva-buddhabodhisattvānām sarvatathāgatānām ca, sa eva bhagavān mahāvajradharaḥ sarva buddhajñānādhipatiḥ iti*. [Tr.: cf. Alex Wayman, *Yoga of the Guhyasamājatantra: the Arcane Lore of Forty Verses*, Delhi 1977, 1991; see also D. Snellgrove, *Indo-Tibetan Buddhism*, Boston 1987, p.630.]

<sup>145</sup> *Jñānasiddhi*, in Dasgupta, *op. cit.*, p.88, n.6:

*Jñānaikacakṣur amalo jñānamūrtis tathāgataḥ,  
niṣkalaḥ sarvago vyāpī śikṣamābījān āśravaḥ.*

<sup>146</sup> *Ibid.*, Dasgupta, *op. cit.*, p.92, n.5: *Svādhidaivatayogena svam ātmānaṃ prapūjayet.*

<sup>147</sup> Dasgupta, *op. cit.*, p.93, n.2:

*Ātmā vai sarvabuddhatvaṃ sarvasauritvaṃ eva ca  
tasmāt sarvaprayatnena hy ātmānaṃ pūjayet sadā.*

the rank of bodhisattva in the tenth stage by the Mahāyāna, Vajrapāṇi found a ready place in the Vajrayāna. However, here the *vajra* which he holds is not only the flaming staff brandished at adversaries of the Buddha, but also the adamant being immanent in beings and phenomena.<sup>148</sup> The polyvalency of his emblem allows of every identification and comparison. Henceforth we can understand the vital rôle played by the former yakṣa in the Buddhist mantras and Tantras. These have still not been properly explored, but the more they are studied, the better we can measure the place occupied by Vajrapāṇi in the immense throng of the deities of Tantric Buddhism.<sup>149</sup> It suffices here to refer the reader to some characteristic texts.

The *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* makes the transition between the Mahāyāna and the Vajrayāna. It was translated into Chinese (T 1191) by T'ien hsi tsai between 980 and 1000 CE, but makes use of texts which had already been translated at the beginning of the eighth century. A Sanskrit recension rediscovered in 1909 and published by Gaṇapati Śāstri differs considerably from the Chinese version. In this work, the Buddha Śākyamuni, surrounded by a vast assembly, addresses Mañjuśrī and gives him instructions concerning mystical rituals with mantras, mudrās, maṇḍalas, etc. Vajrapāṇi also appears in it with his traditional epithets of *yaksendra* or *yakṣeśa* (pp. 25,12; 145,14), *bodhisattva* (pp.11,6; 62,28; 68,20) or *jina-putra* (p.36,2). He is, however, also leader of the family of the thunderbolt (*vajrakula*), whilst Śākyamuni and Avalokiteśvara preside respectively over the family of the Tathāgata and the family of the lotus (*abjakula*).<sup>150</sup> The three families represent the totality of higher beings: the Buddhas, bodhisattvas

<sup>148</sup> On the various meanings of the word *vajra*, see H. von Glasenapp, *Buddhistische Mythen*, Stuttgart 1940, p.21.

<sup>149</sup> Cf. M. Lalou, 'Four Notes on Vajrapāṇi', in *Adyar Library Bulletin* XX, 34, 1956, pp.287-93; 'A Fifth Note on Vajrapāṇi', *ibid.* XXV, 1-4, pp.242-9. In the *Vidyottamamahātanta*, Vajrapāṇi appears as the yakṣa leader, a bodhisattva and is even called Bhagavat; the *Vajrapāṇyabhiṣekamahātanta* describes in its introduction the consecration of the bodhisattva Samantabhadra as 'Thunderbolt-wielder' (*Vajradhara*) and his proclamation as a 'Vajra-in-hand' (*Vajrapāṇi*); it then shows him in his twofold 'vocation' as a cosmic destroyer and an equal to all the Tathāgatas.

<sup>150</sup> See J. Przyluski, 'Les Vidyārāja', in *BEFEO*, 1923, p.301 ff.; D. Snellgrove, *Buddhist Himālaya*, Oxford 1957, pp.62-3.



symbolised by the heavenly lotus and all-powerful beings symbolised by the thunderbolt. These are three aspects of the adamantine being immanent in beings and phenomena.

The *Guhyasamāja* is a tantra tinged with Śāktism; it has been commented upon profusely and at present is still highly regarded in Nepal. It was translated into Chinese at K'ai-fung by Shih-tu in about the year 980 CE (T 885). A Sanskrit recension, differing noticeably from the Chinese version, was published by B. Bhattacharyya in 1931. In this, it is no longer Śākyamuni who appears but a supreme Buddha designated at the beginning of the work by the name of *Bhagavat* (p.1,1), *Bhagavān Mahāvairocanatathāgataḥ* (p.2,13), *Bodhicittavajra* 'diamond of the thought of enlightenment' (p.3,13) and above all – this is the most common name – *Sarvatathāgatakāyavākcittavajrādhipati* 'Sovereign [absorbing] into his [triple] vajra of body, speech and mind the throng of Tathāgatas' (p.3,10). The commentator Candrakīrti identifies this supreme Buddha with Vajradhātu. It is from him that emanate the five Tathāgatas dwelling in his heart and destined to appear in his mystical circle (*maṇḍala*): 1. Akṣobhya, his first emanation and direct *sambhogakāya*, in the centre; 2. Vairocana, to the fore; 3. Ratnaketu, to the south; 4. Lokeśvara (Amitābha) to the north; 5. Amoghavajra, to the west.<sup>151</sup>

During the course of this sūtra, most particularly Chapters xvi and xvii, this supreme Buddha enters into concentration and 'extracts from his triple vajra of body, speech and mind' (*svakāya-vākcittavajrebhyo niscārayati*) quantities of symbols directly or indirectly linked with worship and mysticism: *maṇḍala*, *rahasya*, *pada*, *naya*, *siddhi*, *caryā*, *samaya*, etc. In these chapters, the supreme Buddha, whose nomenclature changes ceaselessly, is presented under the titles of *Bhagavān Vajrapāṇi tathāgataḥ* (pp. 113,4; 114,3; 115,4; 122,9-10; 123,9), *Vajrapāṇi sarvatathāgata-dhipatiḥ* (pp.40,8; 125,1; 128,5; 129,7; 137,1-2), *Kāyavākcittavajrapāṇi* (p.109,9), *Vajrapāṇi sarvatathāgatakāyavākcittavajrādhipatiḥ* (p.134,9). This is a play of interchangeable formulas, but in the minds of Buddhists the epithet Vajrapāṇi could but evoke the memory of the yakṣa Thunderbolt-wielder of the early tradition.

The *Mahāvairocanasūtra* was one of the main authorities of

the purified Tantra which was introduced into China during the first half of the eighth century and directly inspired the Japanese school of Shingon. A manuscript discovered in India by Wu-hsing, reaching Ch'ang-an after the latter's death (in 674), was translated into Chinese by the Indian Subhakarasiṃha (T 848) and commented upon by his pupil I-hsing (T 1796) in 724 and 725 CE.<sup>152</sup>

Like all sūtras, the work begins with the formula: 'Thus have I heard' and specifies the circumstances of time, place and persons: One day, the Bhagavat was standing in the vast palace of the Vajradharmadhātu with a large assembly of Thunderbolt-wielders (*vajradhara*) and great bodhisattvas. The Vajradharas were equal in number to the atoms of ten Buddha-fields; the text cites the names of nineteen of them, and the nineteenth is Vajrapāṇi Guhyakādhipati 'Lord of Mysteries'. Among the great bodhisattvas can be noted the names of Samantabhadra, Maitreya, Mañjuśrī and Sarvanivāraṇaviṣkambhin. A dialogue then takes place between the Bhagavat and Vajrapāṇi Guhyaka; it is mainly concerned with the Sameness of body, speech and mind in the Tathāgata.<sup>153</sup>

However, if the setting of this sūtra is traditional, the interpretation to be given it is wholly new. Here is a summary of that provided by I-hsing in his commentary (T 1796):

'One day' does not mean that the sūtra was expounded on a determined date: its teaching is eternal and transcends the three time-periods: past, present and future.

Here, the 'Bhagavat' is not Śākyamuni but the Buddha Mahāvairocana, the 'Great Illuminator' who dispels darkness, fulfils all functions and shines with an eternal brilliance. The sūtras of the Small Vehicle were expounded to the śrāvakas by the Buddha in his 'transformation body' (*nirmāṇakāya*), in the event the 'historical' Buddha Śākyamuni who had a beginning and an end. Certain sūtras of the Great Vehicle, particularly those that teach the Single Vehicle, were propounded to the bodhisattvas by the Buddha in his 'bliss body' (*sambhogakāya*), a body with a beginning but not with an end: a kind of idealisation of the

<sup>152</sup> See P. Demiéville, in *Inde classique* II, pp.423, 439.

<sup>153</sup> The first chapter of the *Mahāvairocana* has been translated and commented upon by R. Tajima, *Etude sur le Mahāvairocanasūtra*, Paris 1936. I have taken my inspiration greatly from this excellent work.

<sup>151</sup> On all this, see G. Tucci, 'Some Glosses upon the Guhyasamāja', in *MCB* III, 1934-35, pp.341-4.

historical Buddha. Those two teachings constitute exoteric Buddhism. In a quite different perspective, the *Mahāvairocana-sūtra* is expounded by the Buddha in his 'Dharma-essence body' (*svabhāvadharmakāya*), eternal reality grasped by the Buddhas during their enlightenment and accessible to them alone. This last teaching derives from esoteric Buddhism.

It took place, not, as formerly, in some village in India, but 'in the great palace of the Vajradharmadhātu'. This is the place where the Buddhas acquire Bodhi; it is said that it is the celestial palace of Maheśvara. In fact, it is a purely idealised place, located above the triple realm of the Kāma, Rūpa and Ārūpyadhātus.

The 'assembly' which listens to the Buddha does not consist, as in the sūtras of the first two Vehicles, of a lesser or larger number of śrāvakas and bodhisattvas. Here the intimate entourage (*abh-yantaraparivāra*)<sup>154</sup> of the Buddha is formed of a multitude of Vajradharas symbolising the merits of the Tathāgata's knowledge. The wider entourage (*mahāparivāra*) is made up of bodhisattvas symbolising the merits of the Tathāgata's compassion which converts beings. Vajrapāṇi summarises in himself the person of all the other Vajradharas: he presides over the Three Mysteries of the body, speech and mind of the Tathāgata; that is why he is called Lord of Mysteries (*Guhyakādhīpati*), and it is in this quality that he questions Mahāvairocana. Among the bodhisattvas who form the wider entourage can be noted Samantabhadra, Maitreya, Mañjuśrī and Sarvanivāraṇaviṣkambhin, respectively symbolising the Buddha's *bodhicitta*, his great compassion for beings, his knowledge which explains the Dharma and his merit which dispels hindrances.

In fact, the teaching of the *Mahāvairocanasūtra* is a kind of silent colloquium taking place at the very heart of eternal reality. It concerns, as we have seen, the Three Mysteries:

All the bodily actions of Vairocana, all his actions of speech and all his actions of mind are everywhere and at all times, in the world of beings, a teaching of formulas (*padā*) according to the method (*naya*) of the Mantra. It is also manifested in the form of Vajradhara, or of the bodhisattva Samantabhadra, or the bodhisattvas Padmapāṇi, etc., in order to propagate the pure formulas of the

Mantra.<sup>155</sup>

Entry into the discipline of the Mantra consists in brief of three things: 1. the method of the mystery of the body; 2. the method of the mystery of speech; 3. the method of the mystery of the mind... The yogin who, by those three means (*upāya*), has purified his three kinds of action (of body, speech and mind) is empowered (*adhiṣṭhita*) by the Three Mysteries of the Tathāgata and, in the present life, fulfils the [ten] *bhūmis* and the [six] *pāramitās*. He need not pass through numerous *kalpas* in order to perform fully all the practices which serve to counteract [ignorance and the passions].<sup>156</sup>

To summarise, to identify with the Buddha through the practice of the mantras is to accede immediately to perfection.

Vajrapāṇi, who presides over the Three Mysteries, is but one with the Buddha, but it is the same for all beings: what is important is to realise it and mystically achieve this identity.

This immanence allows of every comparison and juxtaposition. From the time of the Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads, Indian thought was familiarised to this play of correspondances which link macrocosm and microcosm with the world of sacrifice, formulas and rituals. The Buddhist Tantra merely resumes and continues ancient speculations which scholasticism passed over in silence but did not eliminate, and which continued on their way in the less enlightened spheres of the population.

Below the primordial Buddha, he is called Bhagavat, Mahāvairocana, Sarvatathāgata-kāyavāk-cittavajrādhipati or simply Vajradhara, Tantric speculation posits five Jinās which are like emanations: Vairocana, Akṣobhya, Ratnasambhava, Amitābha and Amoghasiddhi. Each of them is located at a point in space and in a part of the human body; they correspond to specific aggregates (*skandha*), elements (*dhātu*), objects (*viśaya*) and sense faculties (*indriya*); their respective attributes are a particular colour (*varṇa*), mount (*vāhana*), [symbol (*lakṣaṇa*)], manual gesture (*mudrā*) and graphic seed (*bīja*); each presides over a given family (*kūla*), each possesses his own bodhisattva, his human Buddha (or *nirmāṇa*-body) and his Sakti or personalised female energy.<sup>157</sup>

<sup>155</sup> T 848, ch.1, p.1a27-b3.

<sup>156</sup> T 1796, ch.1, p.579b27-c2.

<sup>157</sup> For details, see S.B. Dasgupta, *Obscure Religious Cults*, Calcutta 1946, p.353; *Introduction to Tantric Buddhism*, Calcutta 1950, p.97; J. Filliozat, in

<sup>154</sup> On the twofold entourage of the Buddha, see earlier, p.127.



Thus the Jina Akṣobhya, the second on the list, has blue as his colour, an elephant as his mount, a thunderbolt as his symbol, earth-touching (*bhūmiśparśa*) as his manual gesture, the syllable *Hūm* as his graphic seed; and his spiritual son is the bodhisattva Vajrapāṇi.

Contrary to appearances, in the Vajrayāna, philosophical speculation plays only a subordinate rôle. Its elaboration proceeds from the mystical ritual but does not command it. It is in no way the fruit of autonomous reasoning, but the hyper-complicated balance of a series of mystical experiences.

Doubtless, before any other process, the adept (*sādhaka*, *mantrin* or *yogin*) proceeds with the sevenfold ceremony: confession of misdeeds (*pāpadeśanā*), delight in the merit of others (*pūṇyānumodanā*), taking refuge in the Three Jewels (*ratnatraya-saraṇagamana*), pledge of perseverance in the Path (*mārgāśrayaṇa*), invitation to the Buddhas to expound the Dharma (*adhyesaṇā*), requesting the same to delay their Nirvāṇa (*yācanā*), transmission of merit to the welfare of creatures (*pariṇamanā*). He doubtless also gives himself over to a series of meditations on the four infinite states (*apramāṇa*) or Brahmagavihāras, on the original purity (*prakṛtipariśuddhatā*) or emptiness (*śūnyatā*) of all phenomena. However, these are only preliminary practices, indeed a kind of tribute paid to the glorious philosophical patrimony accumulated over the centuries by so many Buddhist thinkers and philosophers.<sup>158</sup>

The goal the adept is pursuing is to placate, with more or less acknowledgeable purposes, the benign and wrathful deities, whether Hindu, Buddhist or even of foreign origin, who inhabit his pantheon. To that end, the ritual (*sādhana*) alone matters. It suffices to summon such-and-such a deity from the appropriate mystical syllable which is its seed (*bīja*) and, once it has been invoked, to identify with it by means of the appropriate symbolic gesture (*samayamudrā*) and formula (*mantra*). Thereafter the ceremony is a success (*siddhi*).

To invoke the deity and identify with it, it is highly necessary to know its exact particulars: position in space and in relation to the

human body, colour, posture, manual gesture and attributes and, especially, the syllable that is its seed. No description is too precise or too detailed: the least mistake would doom the ritual to certain failure. The Vajrayāna pantheon welcomes a strange crowd of deities, but the latter, once admitted, are definitively stereotyped. Any liberty or fantasy is refused to the artist who wishes to depict them: he is forced to conform to a fixed and unvarying canon. Like philosophy, art has to yield to ritual and mystery.

Generally – since there are variations depending on the schools – Vajrapāṇi is blue in colour and his symbol is the thunderbolt. Seated or standing, he holds a lotus marked with the sign of the *vajra*, but sometimes he rests the latter against his breast. His ritual gesture is that of offering (*varadamudrā*). He wears a jewel-covered tiara; his body is swathed in garlands and necklaces; his sacred rope is made of pearls.<sup>159</sup>

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

Few personages have had such a long career as Vajrapāṇi, and, if I use the term 'personage', it is because of the lack of an adequate word to designate a being who was in turn a kind of demon (*yakṣa*), a benevolent spirit, a bodhisattva, a deity, even the Supreme Being. He reappears in all the phases of Buddhism; perhaps he even preceded it since his relationship with Indra takes him back to Vedic times. It is not without reason that he has been called *nityānubaddha*, 'eternal escort', ever present, even when he remains invisible to common mortals.

1. At the start of the Buddhist tradition, in the canonical texts, he is still only a yakṣa, guardian of the Trāyastriṃśa gods and servant of Sakra, the Indra of the gods. His personality is as yet ill-defined: both one and several, he represents the group of Vajrapāṇi yakṣas and implies ever behind him the innumerable crowd of his peers. Was he truly a servant of Sakra or was he rather a wrathful form

<sup>159</sup> *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*, tr. M. Lalou, *L'iconographie des étoffes peintes*, Paris 1930, p.33; *Sāghanamālā*, ed. B. Bhattacharyya, I, p.49,13: *Vajrapāṇiś ca śuklā-bho vajrahasto varapradah*; A. Foucher, *Iconographie bouddhique* I, Paris 1900, p.121; A. Grünwedel, *Mythologie des Buddhismus*, Leipzig 1900, pp.140-1; W.E. Clark, *Two Lamaistic Pantheons*, Cambridge, Mass [n.d.], II, pp.8, 11, 56, 197, 201; A. Geigy, *The Gods of Northern Buddhism*, 2nd. ed., Oxford 1928, pp.50-1; B. Bhattacharyya, *Indian Buddhist Iconography*, 2nd. ed., pp.53, 98, and figs 25, 26, 27.

*Inde classique* II, pp.589-90.

<sup>158</sup> Cf. A. Foucher, *Étude sur l'iconographie bouddhique de l'Inde* II, Paris 1905, pp.8-11; L. de La Vallée Poussin, 'Tantrism' in *ERE* XII, pp.195-6.

adopted occasionally by Śakra himself? This is open to doubt: in any case the great exegetist Buddhaghosa refused to distinguish between servant and master, and the old school of sculpture in India only ever depicted Śakra.

2. However, in the literature of the stories and fables which followed the canon of early texts, Vajrapāṇi separates from Śakra and develops his own autonomous activity. He appears in the majority of episodes of the life of Śākyamuni, sometimes with Śakra, sometimes without him. His rôle is very modest: he never speaks and his silence contrasts strongly with the unquenchable fluency of a Śāriputra, Kāśyapa, Ānanda and many other śrāvakas. He merely threatens the Buddha's adversaries with his thunderbolt: recalcitrant sectaries such as Pūraṇa Kāśyapa, traitors such as Devadatta, or wicked dragons such as Apalāla. His threats are rarely carried out: he only breaks rocks and not always skilfully. Furthermore, the texts give the impression that the Buddha could easily do without his assistance: he unloads on him irksome tasks which he himself considers unworthy.

Vajrapāṇi did not enjoy similar success in all parts of India. We saw in the preceding pages how certain sources attribute Vajrapāṇi's exploits to other *amanuṣyas* such as Kumbhīra and Pañcika or ordinary bhikṣus such as Pañthaka. Vajrapāṇi's true homeland is North-West India: it is texts of northern origin such as the *Buddhānusmṛtisamādhi* and the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya which best inform us of his doings; it was while travelling through Afghanistan that the Chinese pilgrims heard of him; finally and above all, it is on the bas-reliefs of the Gandhāran school that the yakṣa makes his presence known. His iconographical type derives from Hellenistic models far more than from Indian motifs. An even more significant fact: Vajrapāṇi who litters the monuments of Uḍḍiyana and Gandhāra with his presence was totally ignored or neglected by the Indian artists of the Mathurā school, although quite close to and virtually contemporary with that of Gandhāra.

3. There is still debate over the local origins of the Mahāyāna, but everyone accepts that, around the Common Era, it was in North-West India that it has its greatest effect. It is therefore not surprising that it enthusiastically adopted the northern yakṣa Vajrapāṇi. It did not hesitate to make him a bodhisattva. As paragons of Sthaviran orthodoxy, the great śrāvakas such as Kāśyapa, Ānanda, Śāriputra and others were too compromised in the canonical writings; to present them point blank as followers of

the nascent Mahāyāna would lack credibility. Conversely, the rallying of Vajrapāṇi to the new ideas offered little difficulty. He belonged with the other demi-gods to the 'sixth destiny', the *gati* of the asuras. These rough and hybrid beings did not hold fixed philosophical convictions but, once tamed, evinced total devotion to the Buddha. For the new propaganda they were ready-made followers. But, dare we say it? As a bodhisattva, the fine yakṣa made a wretched figure faced with a Maitreya, Mañjuśrī or Avalokiteśvara who emerged directly from Mahāyānist invention. It is among those specialists of the *anupattikadharmakṣānti*, and not the Thunderbolt-wielders, that we should seek long and learned discussions of Sūnyatā and Cittamatratā.

Among the śrāvakas who surrounded Śākyamuni, some lived in particularly close contact with the Master: these were the *upasthāyakas* or attendants. The early texts mention eight of them, but the most important was Ānanda who served the Buddha for the last twenty-five years of his life on earth. To this assembly of śrāvakas the Mahāyāna sūtras added an assembly of bodhisattvas. Henceforth a twofold entourage could be discerned around the Buddha: an intimate entourage (*abhyantaraparivāra*) and a wider entourage (*mahāparivāra*). According to Nāgārjuna and his school, the wider entourage consisted of two large assemblies of śrāvakas and bodhisattvas; as for the intimate entourage, it was represented by only two confidants: the disciple Ānanda and the bodhisattva Vajrapāṇi.

The Mahāyānists never contemplated dispensing with Ānanda, whom the Buddha had proclaimed as the foremost memoriser of his words, but they gave him a bodhisattva as assistant, in this instance Vajrapāṇi. When with the Master, Ānanda represents the Small Vehicle and Vajrapāṇi the Great. Henceforth the śrāvaka and the bodhisattva worked in tandem. According to certain authors, Ānanda and Vajrapāṇi together compiled the texts of the Great Vehicle, and it is sometimes to one and sometimes to the other that the Buddha entrusts the transmission (*parīdanā*) and protection (*rakṣaṇa*) of the Mahāyāna sūtras.

4. In the eighth century CE the growing influence of the Hindu substratum on the Buddhist communities provoked a blossoming of a new way of deliverance: the Vajrayāna or Diamond Vehicle, strongly tinged with monism. Without as such renouncing Mahāyānist speculation on Sūnyatā and Cittamatratā, the new theoreticians posited, beyond all distinctions, a Supreme Being im-



manent in beings and phenomena: in fact, a *Brahman-ātman*, but which was qualified as Vajrasattva, 'Diamond being'. This great deity (*adhidevatā*) is omnipresent and it is up to each individual to find it in him/herself and merge with it, not through gnosis but by means of appropriate formulas (*mantra*) and mystical rituals (*sādhana*).

The texts designate the Diamond Being by various names: Vajrasattva, Vajradhara, Mahāvairocana, Kāyavākcittavajrādhipati, etc., but also as Vajrapāṇi. Hence the word originally reserved for the yakṣa and bodhisattva with whom we are concerned can also now apply to the Adamantine Being, the one Bhagavat, the true Tathāgata. In the Tantras, Vajrapāṇi is the Vajrasattva or at least an aspect of the Vajrasattva: as Guhyakādhipati, 'Lord of Mysteries' he presides over the Three Mysteries of body, speech and mind that characterise the Buddha 'in his *dharma-kāya*'.

Such is the theory. However, in practice, in order to respond to the demands of mystical processes, Vajrapāṇi is, besides, one of the very numerous deities populating the Vajrayāna pantheon. He also possesses his 'anthropometric file' in which his family, colour, symbol, manual gestures and mount are carefully consigned. By conforming to these indications one can place him precisely in the mystical circle (*maṇḍala*) and evoke him for whatever purpose by means of the appropriate ritual (*sādhana*).

A secondary form of Indra, guardian spirit of Śākyamuni, bodhisattva attached along with Ananda to the service of the Master, deity emanating from the Supreme Being: Vajrapāṇi. The secret of his fortune and apotheosis in the course of time is found in the Vajra, his inseparable emblem. Vajra is the *thunderbolt* which serves as an offensive and defensive weapon: it is also the *diamond*, the hardest of minerals.

*Translated by Sara Boin-Webb*

[See also Gouriswar Bhattacharya, 'The Buddhist Deity Vajrapāṇi', *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 4, (1995-96), pp.323-54.]

## THE STATUS OF MONKS: STATE REGULATIONS CONCERNING BUDDHIST MONKS IN THE KORYŌ DYNASTY

SEM VERMEERSCH

In his Ten Injunctions for future rulers, the founder of the Koryō dynasty (918-1392) posthumously known as King T'aejo (r.918-43), laid down the foundations on which the dynasty was to be based. According to these principles, Buddhism was to play a decisive role in ensuring the success of the new dynasty. The first Injunction states literally that 'for our great enterprise we need to procure the protective power of all the Buddhas. Therefore we have established Sōn and Kyo monasteries and sent out abbots to practise and propagate their respective doctrines'.<sup>1</sup> We can therefore infer that Buddhism was an important factor in the legitimization of Koryō's political authority.<sup>2</sup> There is evidence that King T'aejo intended to keep Buddhism and politics separated, but inevitably the religion's status of official ideology enhanced its power and secular influence.<sup>3</sup> Officials steeped in Confucian

<sup>1</sup> KRS 2: 15a. There is some controversy regarding the authenticity of the Ten Injunctions. The Japanese scholar Imanishi Ryū claimed that in their current form they were actually manufactured during the reign of King Hyōnjong (1009-31). See his 'Kōrai Taiso Kunyō-jūjō ni tsuite', *Tōyō gahukō* 8-3 (1918), pp.419-33. Imanishi's views have been refuted by Korean scholars. See for example Kim Sōng-jun, 'Sip hunyo was Koryō T'aejo ūi chōngch'i sasang', *Han'guk chungse chōngch'i pōpche sa yōn'gu*, Seoul 1985.

<sup>2</sup> The legitimating function of Buddhism in the Koryō period is further explored in my PhD dissertation: 'The Power of Buddha. The Ideological and Institutional Role of Buddhism in the Koryō Dynasty', SOAS, London 2001.

<sup>3</sup> According to Ch'oe Cha (1180-1260), author of the *Pohan chip*, T'aejo refuted the allegation of his advisor Ch'oe Ŭng (?-932) that he wanted to use Buddhism as the principle of his government. In this (fictional?) dialogue recorded by Ch'oe Cha, T'aejo confided to his advisor that his attention to Bud-

official traditions of statecraft were aware of the dangers of giving too much power to Buddhism, and often warned against blurring the boundaries between politics and religion.<sup>4</sup> However, Neo-Confucian critics of the late Koryô period went one step further, alleging that the dynasty effectively used Buddhism as the basis for its government.

The scapegoating of Buddhism by Neo-Confucian elite groups was motivated by their own agenda of putting in place a new authority. It is not possible here to go into the details of how and why Buddhism was blamed as the cause of Koryô's woes. Suffice it to point out the unfortunate result of this agenda: the intentional distortion of Buddhism in historiography. The *Koryôsa*, virtually our only source for the history of Koryô, either ignores Buddhism or tries to represent it as an ineffective tool of government. The outcome is that we are still very much in the dark on the actual position of Buddhism in the body politic of Koryô. Yet there is one type of source, contained in the *Koryôsa*, which offers the chance of getting closer to the attitude of Koryô's legislators and officials towards Buddhism, namely the regulations and edicts concerning that religion. This material has not yet been systematically studied. As legislative acts of the previous dynasty, these law statutes were copied scrupulously by Chosôn historians. Although the compilers of the *Koryôsa* were biased in their selection of statutes, presumably choosing those that put Buddhism in a negative light, a careful against-the-grain reading of this material can definitely enhance our understanding of Koryô's policy *vis-à-vis* Buddhism. The main purpose of this article is therefore to ascertain the legal status of monks, as defined and/or restricted by laws, rather than their social status, though this latter aspect will also be briefly touched upon. A translation of all the remaining law statutes concerning Buddhism has been appended at the end of this article.

### *General remarks on the legal status of Buddhism*

From the very early stages of its development in ancient India, the religion adopted a strict code of practice (Vinaya) for its monks. Besides creating an environment conducive to religious practice, this code also served to preclude state intervention. Faced with a peaceful and well-ordered community, the secular authorities would find it difficult to justify any actions against the religion. The Vinaya was also meant to give the Buddhist Saṃgha a special status within Indian society. Ancient Indian society was conceived of as a complex system of separate units, each with its own conventional law. Buddhism became such a recognised unit, acting autonomously within a certain perimeter. It was the king's constitutional duty to see that none of these social units suffered from external or internal disruption, but also to see that the conventional law of each unit was not transgressed.<sup>6</sup>

When Buddhism entered other societies, however, the governments of these societies were not always prepared to recognise this special status. This was notably so in China, where the state used the provision of the Indian system that the ruler could intervene to keep the conventional law of the Saṃgha (i.e. the Vinaya) from being transgressed as a pretext to impose strict control on the 'foreign' religion through special legislation and through the creation of special government organs. Yet, although the Saṃgha was not recognised as an entity autonomous from the state, the special status of the monks as religious practitioners was usually honoured, and monks were exempt from services to the state.

The two main strategies to impose secular authority over religious authority mirrored the twofold division of the Vinaya. The latter consisted principally, on the one hand, of the list of infractions against the monastic code (*prātimokṣa*) and, on the other, of regulations concerning community life and ritual (*karma-vācānā*).<sup>7</sup> The latter mainly embraced the ritual entry to the monkhood (ordination). The Chinese state, chiefly under the Tang, devised a body of legislation concerning on one side the behaviour of monks and on the other strict regulations concerning entry to the monkhood.<sup>8</sup> The Koryô also adopted legislation concerning

dharma was merely a concession to the people's customs and that it would soon be replaced by superior traditions [for government]. See *Pohan chip* 1, KMC 2: 106.

<sup>4</sup> Thus Ch'oe Sûng-no (927-89), who had been presented to King T'aejo as a child prodigy, reminded King Sôngjong (r.981-97) that 'Confucianism is for governing the country, Buddhism for personal salvation'. KRS 93: 19a.

<sup>5</sup> See John Goulde, 'Anti-Buddhist Polemic in Fourteenth and Fifteenth Century Korea: the Emergence of Confucian Exclusivism' (unpublished PhD dissertation, Harvard University 1985), pp.174 ff.

<sup>6</sup> Sukumar Dutt, *Buddhist Monks and Monasteries of India*, London 1962, p.80.

<sup>7</sup> Etienne Lamotte, *History of Indian Buddhism*, Louvain-La-Neuve 1988, p.165.

<sup>8</sup> See Stanley Weinstein, *Buddhism under the T'ang*, Cambridge 1987.



entry to the monkhood and the actions of ordained monks, but developed this along somewhat different lines from the Chinese pattern. The evidence is fragmentary: the Koryô law code is no longer extant, so that we have to rely on the information contained in the 'treatise on judicial law' of the *Koryôsa* as well as on the relevant decrees and discussions in the annals section of the *Koryôsa*.

### Ordination restrictions

The Koryô dynasty imposed various restrictions on entry to the monkhood. Regulation of the 'supply' of new monks to the Saṃgha was the main instrument to contain the power of the religious institution. The Vinaya tried to anticipate state infraction by allowing only 'those who dispose freely of their person' into the Order, while barring 'those who are subject to any deleterious impediment: a crime or a contagious disease'.<sup>9</sup> In China, especially under the Tang, the state recognised the special status of Buddhist monks, but claimed the right to determine that status. Under a system of state-supervised ordinations, only a certain number of people were granted the official monk's certificate, without which no one could claim to be a monk. The main motivation behind this system was to keep the number of monks low. As monks were regarded as non-productive members of society, who neither paid taxes nor performed corvée labour, the state was anxious to prevent people from joining the Saṃgha merely to avoid their duties. One of the preventive measures taken was to test the applicants for ordination on their knowledge of the sūtras. Sometimes the state also resorted to corrective measures such as mass defrocking, nominally to 'purify the Saṃgha' but in fact out of economic and political considerations.<sup>10</sup>

The Koryô dynasty also imposed legal restrictions on ordinations. A general rule, which was apparently in force throughout the dynasty, prevented people registered in special administrative areas from joining the Saṃgha. These areas include the *hyang* (villages) and *pugok* (boroughs), populated mainly by slaves and

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p.55.

<sup>10</sup> Kenneth K.S. Ch'en, *The Chinese Transformation of Buddhism*, Princeton 1973, pp.86 ff. Eventually, however, the logic of this measure was inverted, as government agencies sold monks' certificates for cash to raise revenue for the state.

base people (*ch'ônmin*), as well as military and border regions.<sup>11</sup> Later, a restriction was imposed on the number of people per household who could become ordained. In 1036, King Chôngjong decreed that:

Every [household] which has four sons, is allowed to have one son leave the household [to become monk] on the ordination platforms of Yôngt'ong, Sungbôp, Powôn and Tonghwa temples, [where] he will be tested on the sūtras and Vinaya of the relevant school.<sup>12</sup>

Two decades later, in 1059, King Munjong slightly relaxed the regulation imposed by his predecessor, and decreed that 'in a family with three sons, it is allowed for one son of the age of fifteen to shave his hair and become monk.'<sup>13</sup> Instead of one in four, one in three sons in a household could henceforth be ordained. However, this new regulation was only enforced for 'people of the two capitals and the prefectures and counties of the south-east.' This curious restriction can perhaps be explained by the prosperity attained under Munjong's reign. The financial situation in the favoured areas may have been healthy enough to allow more people to become unproductive.<sup>14</sup>

The rule that only one in four (or one in three) sons could be ordained, if effectively enforced, undoubtedly limited the number of monks. It also implies that the state interest came first: only after it was guaranteed that the quotas for corvée and tax duties

<sup>11</sup> KRS 85:6a.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* 6: 8a. The first two temples were located in the capital, Powôn-sa is in Ch'ungch'ông-do and Tonghwa-sa in Kyôngsang-do.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* 8: 14a.

<sup>14</sup> Ch'oe Chin-sôk, 'Koryô hugi ûi toch 'ôpche', *Kyônghûi sahak* 3 (1972), p.44, infers that the general economic prosperity may have tempted King Munjong to relax the rule. Ch'oe does not give any translation for this passage, but seems to assume that it applies to the whole country. It is therefore worth mentioning Yi Sang-sôn's interpretation ('Koryô sidae ûi suwôn sūngdo e taehan koch'al', *Sungsil sahak* I [1983], pp.32-3). He translates the passage as follows: 'families of the two capitals, and the eastern and southern [capitals] and the prefectures and counties.' In this reading, the decree would apply to the whole country, but it stretches the grammar a bit. Also, the southern capital was only established after this decree was issued, in 1067. See Pak Yong-un, *Koryô sidaesa*, Seoul 1996, pp.363-4.



could be met might religious interests come into play. The exclusion of people from certain administrative areas further restricted the number of monks. This was an implicit discrimination against people from the lower social strata who lived in these areas. The law, furthermore, also explicitly barred slaves from the monkhood.<sup>15</sup> Another restriction is contained in the decree of 1036, which states that candidate monks will be examined on their knowledge of the sūtras. To enforce this regulation, ordination could only take place in certain specially designated ordination temples.<sup>16</sup>

Once the monk had been successfully ordained, he was given a certificate and registered in the special monastic register. As with all subjects of Koryô, monks were listed in census records, in this case in the Monastic Register (*sûngjôk*), which were compiled every three years.<sup>17</sup> However, towards the end of the Koryô signs emerged that the system was not functioning very well. In 1325, King Ch'ungsuk decreed that the households of local clerks (*[hyang]ni*) were strictly forbidden to have a son ordained if they contained three sons or less. Where there were more sons, one was allowed to become a monk, but only after he had reported to

the secular authorities to obtain his monk's certificate (*toch 'ôp*).<sup>18</sup>

In all likelihood, monks' certificates existed before that time, but they seem to have become an issue only towards the end of the dynasty, when they suddenly appear in the sources. By that time, the state was clearly having problems in enforcing the registration system. Ch'oe Chinsôk, in his study of monks' certificates in the late Koryô era, concludes that the state was not so much concerned with controlling Buddhism as with controlling the social movements of the day.<sup>19</sup> Also, Confucian statesmen became more vociferous in their criticism of Buddhism. Yi Saek (1328-96) thus bluntly advised that all monks without valid certificates should be drafted into the army.<sup>20</sup> Other laws issued at the time seem to admit that people normally prevented from ordaining were effectively entering the monkhood. One policy directive, issued in 1356, mentions that many people belonging to the class of local village functionaries (*hyangni*) and slaves were dodging their corvée and tax duties by joining the Saṃgha. The directive also stipulated that henceforth those without certificates could no longer receive private ordination.<sup>21</sup> Essentially, this directive merely reiterates the decree of 1036, admitting it was not effective. It is not certain why it specifically targets the class of village functionaries. Presumably transgressions were especially frequent among this group. Also, recent research has confirmed Ch'oe Chinsôk's argument that local society was in turmoil at that time, with many *hyangni* trying to establish themselves as part of the central capital elite. The directive was thus part of government efforts to assert control over this group.<sup>22</sup> This shows that certain social groups were targeted as needed in ordination legislation, with some groups excluded altogether. Koryô laws thus clearly discriminated against status background in the selection of prospective monks.

### Other legislation regarding the Saṃgha

Besides regulating entry to the monkhood, the state also scrutinised the conduct of ordained monks and nuns and regularly issued new regulations to punish serious transgressions. It is not

<sup>15</sup> In 1135, there was a ban on slaves 'taking the place of monks (*taesin sûng*)' (KRS 85: 43a). The phrasing is somewhat puzzling; perhaps it means that slaves could only appropriate the status of monks but were inherently unable to claim that status. Towards the end of the Koryô, slaves managed to join the Saṃgha anyway, which prompted the implementation of a registration scheme. Besides this discrimination against status, there may also have been a gender discrimination. In 1017, a ban on the ordination of women was issued (*ibid.* 85: 9a). This is rather puzzling, as other regulations clearly referred to nuns, which means that the existence of an Order of nuns was not contested. Perhaps the phrase should be read in conjunction with the preceding sentence: 'The ban regarding the bequeathing of one's house to make it a temple and of one's spouse to become a nun is renewed.'

<sup>16</sup> On the ordination temples, see Han Ki-mun, *Koryô sawôn ûi kujo wa kinûng*, Seoul 1998, pp.353-72. It is not certain whether the ordination temples were supervised by civil or Saṃgha officials.

<sup>17</sup> Normal census documents were compiled every year (KRS 79:1a). However, in the beginning of the dynasty they were apparently compiled every three years (*ibid.* 79: b). The registry of monks was managed by a government organ staffed by monks, the *sûngnoksû* (Saṃgha Register). See Yi Chang-yong (1201-72), *Yaktûng wi yangga tosûngnok kwan 'go*, TMS 27.

<sup>18</sup> KRS 85: 17a.

<sup>19</sup> Ch'oe Chin-sôk, 'Koryô hugi ûi toch 'ôpche', p.50.

<sup>20</sup> KRS 115: 8a.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.* 85: 19b.

<sup>22</sup> See John B. Duncan, *The Origins of the Chosôn Dynasty*, Seattle 2000, *passim*.



known whether the Koryô dynasty had a special code of law for Buddhist monastics similar to the Chinese 'Rules concerning Buddhist and Taoist clergy' (*Daoseng ge*) or the Japanese 'Statutes for monks and nuns' (*Sôni-ryô*).<sup>23</sup> However, even a cursory look at the statutes of Buddhism in the chapters on judicial law in the *Koryôsa* reveals that the authorities regularly issued decrees and *ad hoc* laws governing aspects of the monks' life that are normally covered by the Vinaya. They are in the form of injunctions (*kûmnyông*) and do not stipulate punishments for offenders.

Already during the reign of Kwangjong (r.949-75), there emerged clear abuses of the monks' status, when many took advantage of Kwangjong's lavish patronage of Buddhism to join the monkhood merely to fill their stomachs.<sup>24</sup> This prompted Ch'oe Sûngno, minister to Kwangjong's successor, King Sôngjong, to write a powerful indictment of the excesses committed in the name of Buddhism, urging Sôngjong to take action. More specifically, he requested that the king put a halt to excessive offerings and donations initiated by Kwangjong, to forbid loan sharking by monasteries, stop the conferment of excessive honours on monks, forbid monks from using government hostels and postal stations, remove idols from Buddhist ceremonies, forbid the practice of using public funds and corvée labourers for temple construction, forbid the fabrication of Buddhist statues from precious materials and, finally, take a more reserved attitude towards Buddhism.<sup>25</sup>

Some of the proposals in Ch'oe Sûngno's memorial are quoted in the 'Treatise on judicial law', namely the proscriptions on using government hostels and postal stations, on the allocation of government funds and corvée labour for temple building and on the use of precious materials for Buddhist statues.<sup>26</sup> According to the 'Treatise', Ch'oe's memorial was sent in 982, the first full year of Sôngjong's reign, but it is not said whether the memorial was accepted and put into effect. This suggests that it was merely an indictment of Kwangjong's reign and not a real clampdown on Buddhist privileges.<sup>27</sup> Also, Ch'oe's critique was mainly concerned

with those Buddhist practices that cost the state money, not so much with the conduct of monks. Ch'oe advocated a separation of Buddhism and politics, but although he deplored the king's devotion to Buddhism, he refrained from criticising religious ideas or practices in themselves, presumably because this went against the leading ideology.<sup>28</sup>

There is ample evidence that many monks flouted their code of conduct, yet the state never resorted to mass laicisation as was the case in China. King Munjong (r.1046-83), however, seems to have come close to taking such action. A decree issued by him in 1056 was a stringent indictment of malpractices in the Buddhist Order (see appendix A). Munjong, though known to have been an ardent supporter of Buddhism – like most Koryô kings – clearly saw it as his prerogative to impose adherence to the Vinaya and wanted those monks who violated it to be tried by secular law. His decree threatens to 'purify' the Saṃgha, though it is not known whether or not this threat was actually carried out. In any case, it gives a good idea of the vices that were apparently most rampant at the time. Six main issues emerge in the decree: avoiding corvée duty, engaging in trade, sexual transgressions, alcoholism, lavish dress and too frequent mingling with secular people. Evidence from other sources suggests that these problems were endemic throughout the Koryô period.

#### *Avoidance of corvée duty*

The decree of 1056 alleges first of all that many joined the Saṃgha to avoid corvée labour. This was clearly a continuing problem. In

---

memorial at their disposal (reproduced under Ch'oe Sûng-no's biography in the *Koryôsa*), but did not know whether or not it was adopted. They just inserted it in the annals section under the year it was sent, assuming that it was adopted. It is not clear on what basis they made a summary of the memorial, but perhaps only the points that they assumed were retained for policy recommendations were reproduced.

<sup>28</sup> The contrast with the outright criticism voiced during the early Chosôn is revealed in the historiography of Koryô. The Chosôn historiographers were, as a matter of principle, restricted to using only excerpts from Koryô annals, not their personal accounts. On at least one occasion, the enshrinement of a Buddha relic by King Injong, the compilers of the *Koryôsa chôryo* felt compelled to condemn this and inserted a 'note by the historian' (*sasin waf*). KRSC 9: 50a-b.

<sup>23</sup> Kenneth Ch'en, *The Chinese Transformation*, pp.95 ff.

<sup>24</sup> KRS 2: 30a.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.* 93: 12b-19b. Translated by Edward Schultz and Hugh Kang in Peter Lee (ed.), *Sourcebook of Korean Civilization*, New York 1993, Vol.1, pp.289-92.

<sup>26</sup> KRS 85: 7b-8a.

<sup>27</sup> In all likelihood, the compilers of the *Koryôsa* only had the text of the

1130, the students of the National Academy, the leading Confucian institution, sent a petition to King Injong protesting against the Censorate's advice that their expenses be reduced. They argued that the ruler is supposed to put Confucianism first, and that Buddhism was more wasteful. The students claimed that 'thousands, if not tens of thousands of people avoided corvée and filled their bellies by living in temples.'<sup>29</sup> Without saying so explicitly, they clearly hinted that the ruler should look for extra revenue from these monastics rather than cut the budget of Confucian students.

Here we should be careful in ascertaining the exact meaning of these allegations. As seen in the discussion above of ordination restrictions, the law was designed, in the interest of the corvée system, to permit only the surplus number of males in a household to become monks and, moreover, barred people of low social status from ordination. If the law was being implemented, there would not have been much ground for complaint. If the sources mention that many avoided corvée by becoming monks, in all likelihood they do not refer to those monks who avoided the corvée service legally, but to others who managed to escape into the monasteries. If we take a closer look at King Munjong's decree, it says literally 'there are many disciples who call themselves *śramaṇa* who avoid the corvée duty.'<sup>30</sup> The allegations seem directed at people who pretended to be monks rather than at true monks, a distinction discussed in the following section.

### *Engaging in trade*

Another sore spot in the relation between Saṃgha and state was the issue of monastic trade and possessions. In 1028, a Letter of Instruction stated that 'monks and nuns cheat the ignorant people, they gather all kinds of assets and transport them with horses of the postal relays, causing great damage,' and ordered officials to prevent this.<sup>31</sup> How they cheated these people is not explained here, but a decree of 1188 stated that monks illegally claimed tribute households and free farmers for their agricultural estates.<sup>32</sup> The same decree mentioned that the monks forced loans of paper

[money] or cloth on the poor to make more profits. In 1312, proselytising monks were forbidden to come to the capital or to amass any wealth.<sup>33</sup> In the following year, all those in office together with monks were forbidden to engage in any form of trade.<sup>34</sup>

### *Sexual transgressions*

There is considerable evidence that monks did not take their vow of chastity very seriously in Koryô. Sexual transgressions always occurred, but in the case of Koryô it seems that married monks were not unusual. An entry in the *Koryôsa* for the year 1029 casually mentions the existence of married monks (*yuch 'ôpsûng*) as a special category: 'Married monks are to be drafted as corvée disciples for [?the construction of] Chunggwang-sa.'<sup>35</sup> This undoubtedly refers to the class of monks' disciples rather than to ordinary monks. However, the existence of many sons of monks reveals that even properly ordained monks frequently indulged their sexual passion. Sons of monks were so common that legislation was drafted specifically applying to them. This legislation frequently discriminated against the sons of monks for official appointments.<sup>36</sup> One possible surmise is that this referred to sons conceived before the monk left the household life, but this is not very likely.<sup>37</sup>

In the second half of the dynasty at the latest, it is evident that many monks lived a family life. In 1281, corruption was wide-

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.* 85: 16b.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.* 85: 16b.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.* 5: 12a.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.* 11: 33a-b. In 1102, the Censorate objected to the appointment of Yi Che-ro to office, as he was the son of a blind monk Pôpchong. King Sukchong overruled this objection, stating that one should not ignore a talented person on account of his father. In 1062, it had been ruled that sons of monks could not hold office, though grandsons could (*ibid.* 75: 22b). Another entry for the same year reveals that on the local level, monks' sons were also barred from becoming village head or vice-head (*ibid.* 75: 47a). In 1152, sons and grandsons of monks were allowed to hold office, but only posts for the seventh rank or below of the military (*sôban*) or court official (*namban*) careers (*ibid.* 75: 24a-b). As the first example indicates, decisions on individual cases were made on an *ad hoc* basis. See also the example of Kim Ku, *ibid.* 106: 13a.

<sup>37</sup> As Robert Buswell assumes, see his *Tracing Back the Radiance: Chinul's Korean Way of Zen*, Honolulu 1991, p.18.

<sup>29</sup> KRS 74: 30a.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.* 7: 40a.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.* 85: 9b.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.* 85: 12a.



spread among monks, who paid bribes to obtain ranks and offices. The people called them 'silk Sôn masters, gauze priors'. The *Koryôsa* alleges that more than half of these elite monks had a spouse and family.<sup>38</sup> Towards the end of the dynasty, the authorities tried to reverse this situation. Investigating censors informed the court in 1339 that ladies from the cities went to mountain temples for Buddhist banquets, where some had illicit meetings with monks.<sup>39</sup> In the beginning of the Chosôn dynasty, many allegations were made of sexual misconduct by monks. A memorial submitted in 1402 by the Board of Rites claimed that many monks had wives and children to support. Such claims should perhaps be qualified because of the anti-Buddhist attitude of the early Chosôn officials, but in view of the other evidence this allegation seems well founded.<sup>40</sup>

### Alcoholism

That Koryô monks were fond of the jar is also well attested. The authorities repeatedly tried to forbid monks to brew or drink wine, as evidenced by bans or edicts from 1010,<sup>41</sup> 1021<sup>42</sup> and 1130.<sup>43</sup> Literary sources confirm that temples were often the setting for leisurely outings by literati or even the king, and more often than not these gentlemen would be joined by the monks for a drink. Public drunkenness was not unusual, and to a certain degree was tolerated, even among monks. The poet Yi Illo (1150-1220) wrote in his *P'ahan chip* how an eminent monk of the Pôpsông sect went to the Buddhist sanctuary in the palace and fell asleep because he was stone-drunk.<sup>44</sup> The poems of Yi Kyubo (1168-1241) also contain some *tableaux vivants* of drunken monks. One poem was even inspired by the sight of a drunken monk lying by the side of the

<sup>38</sup> KRS 29: 34a.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.* 85: 18a.

<sup>40</sup> *T'aejong sillok* 3: 36b. See also John Goulde, 'Anti-Buddhist Polemic', pp. 208-44 *passim*. Later, the Confucian scholar Sông Hyôn (1439-1504) also claimed that abbots 'sometimes have slave-girls as concubines, and are wealthier than the "Three Dukes and Nine Ministers".' *Yongjae ch'onghwa* 8. It is not certain whether he referred to the Koryô period or his own time.

<sup>41</sup> KRS 85: 8b.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.* 85: 9a.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.* 85: 11a.

<sup>44</sup> KMC Vol.2, *P'ahan chip* 2: 9a.

street.<sup>45</sup> An official expression of toleration of this culture of drinking can be seen in a report drafted in 1278 by the Military Commissioner for the capital, who recommended that for important festivities, including the Buddhist Lantern Festival and the native P'alwan-hoe, wine was indispensable.<sup>46</sup>

### Monastic dress

The issue of monastic dress is another indication of how much monks could get away with. The Japanese monk Dôgen, when studying in China, met two Koryô monks in 1224. He was impressed by their erudition, but was surprised by the fact that they 'were neither clad in robes nor did they carry an almsbowl, they looked like laymen.'<sup>47</sup> This little incident is a vivid illustration of an endemic problem for the Koryô authorities. In 1012, King Hyônjong complained that the dress of monks was becoming more and more luxurious, making it difficult to distinguish them from lay people. He therefore instructed officials to establish a dress code for monks.<sup>48</sup> It took until 1027 before detailed regulations were issued. Monks were forbidden to wear white robes, leggings, silk gauze reins [?], silk gowns, leather shoes, coloured caps, conical bamboo hats or hat straps.<sup>49</sup> Except for the bamboo hats, the kinds of attire mentioned here are really quite extravagant, suggesting that monks still had considerable leeway in the matter of dress. Later on, the wearing of specific types of bamboo hats was allowed again.<sup>50</sup>

### Contacts with lay people

One final issue mentioned in Munjong's decree is the allegation

<sup>45</sup> KMC Vol.1, *Yi Kyu-bo chôn chip* 7: 8a. I have tentatively translated it as follows:

One should not mock a holy man among worthies,  
Pure as the alcohol flavour of a refined liquor;  
Once cognising that the spirit of dregs and yeast is coarse and fierce,  
He is released in a state of adamant absorption.

<sup>46</sup> KRS 85: 13b. The alcohol may have been needed for ritual purposes, but it was certainly consumed by all those attending.

<sup>47</sup> Takashi James Kodera, *Dogen's Formative Years in China. An Historical Study and Annotated Translation of the 'Hôkyôki'*, London 1980, p.48.

<sup>48</sup> KRS 85: 8b.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.* 85: 9b.

<sup>50</sup> In 1260 (*ibid.* 85:13a) and 1307 (*ibid.* 85: 16a)

that monks mixed too freely with commoners. They were forbidden to stay in commoners' houses,<sup>51</sup> but the state also tried to prevent contact between lay people taking place on the occasion of rituals or festivals held in temples. In 1131, a memorial by the Commission for Divination (*ûmyang hoeûi*) complained that recently,

Monks and lay people are freely gathering at events they call 'Myriad Buddha Fragrant Following', some chant the Buddha's name and read sūtras, but they are only feigning and bragging; some of the monks' followers sell wine and onions; some take up arms to commit crimes, they dance around and play games in a chaotic and vulgar manner.<sup>52</sup>

Earlier, in 1100, a ban had already been issued on monks and nuns jointly participating in these Myriad Buddha gatherings.<sup>53</sup> Later, it was even forbidden for people to go to temples at all, unless it was for a memorial rite for parents.<sup>54</sup> As seen, there was official concern for the lax moral norms of the monks, which could be further corrupted by visits from women, but it seems that these restrictions were mainly intended to counter the negative influence of temples on the population and improve their moral image.

### *Status divisions within the monkhood*

Koryô sources frequently mention a special category within the Saṃgha, referred to as 'monks' disciples' (*sûngdo*) or 'monks' disciples dependent on the monastery' (*suwôn sûngdo*) ('monastery dependents' for short). Their exact status is difficult to determine, but they seem to have been an officially recognised group within Koryô society. This is apparent from a memorial on military reform submitted by Yun Kwan in 1104. Yun proposed the creation of a special army unit from the monks' disciples. He argued that

Since the beginning of the dynasty, all the temples have had monastery dependents (*suwôn sûngdo*), who usually fulfil corvée labour, just like the people from the prefectures and counties. A large number of them, running to thousands, are

normally productive [i.e. they farm for their living]. Whenever the country has to raise an army, we should also recruit monastery dependents and attach them to the army.<sup>55</sup>

Yun thus argued that the monks' disciples should be treated like ordinary people and therefore also be called up for military duty in emergencies. Yet the fact that he had to argue this case and petition the authorities to consider them as ordinary citizens proves that they were not. The existence of a special class of monks is confirmed by the statesman Yi Kok (1298-1351) in his observation that there were three categories of monks in Koryô: 'The lowest category of monks have taken the tonsure, but live in a family; they evade taxation but make a livelihood.'<sup>56</sup> Xu Jing, a Chinese emissary of the Song dynasty who visited Korea in 1123, also wrote about a group of people who were, he claimed, known as 'householder monks' (Ch. *zaijia heshang*). His description tallies with Yun Kwan's and Yi Kok's points about monastery dependents, and confirms that by 1123 Yun Kwan's proposals had been put into effect (see appendix C).

Xu Jing's account also confirms that the *sûngdo* 'fulfilled corvée duty for monks'. Instead of performing regular corvée duty, they were assigned to work for temples.<sup>57</sup> At least one case is known where monks' disciples were assigned to such work.<sup>58</sup> An important part of their service to the temples consisted of military duties. Many temples had militias, which were employed notably during the military period (1170-1256) in conflicts between tem-

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.* 81: 12b-13a.

<sup>56</sup> Yi Kok, *Choch'i Kûngang Tosan-sa ki*, KMC, Vol.3, p.23: Tosan-sa was built in 1339 by the Superintendent for the military of the two capitals Cho Rae, who made it a very open temple. Yi Kok made a distinction between three categories of monks; while he did not explicitly state that the lowest category corresponded to the monks' disciples, this seems to have been the case. Also, it should be pointed out that, though his classification was apparently based on the degree of religious practice, not social status distinctions, I surmise that this scheme betrays a certain class consciousness, insofar as it was assumed that the lowest category of monks came from the lower social orders.

<sup>57</sup> This explanation was put forward by Yi Sang-sôn, 'Koryô sidae ûi suwôn sûngdo', *op. cit.*

<sup>58</sup> KRS 5: 12a: 'Married monks are to be drafted as corvée disciples (*yôkto*) for [the construction of?] Chunggwang-sa.'

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.* 85: 6a.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.* 85: 11a. The memorial proposed to abolish these practices, and a royal decree endorsed this.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.* 85: 10a-b.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.* 85: 13b. This ban was issued in 1275.



ples and the military dictatorship.<sup>59</sup> However, the monks' disciples were mobilised not only for the temple militias, but also in times of national crisis, when the monasteries released them for military service.<sup>60</sup> In the end, the monks' disciples seem to have been hardly any better off working for the temples – perhaps the main difference to normal freehold peasants was that they somehow belonged to monasteries and were exempt from tax duties. In contrast to tenants who farmed monastic land, they were in a kind of relationship of servitude to the temples. Apparently this was masked by making them formally aspirants to the monkhood, hence the terms 'monks' disciples'.

At the other end of the spectrum were monks of aristocratic or even royal origin. It seems to have been a custom among aristocratic families and the royal clan to have the fourth son ordained as a monk.<sup>61</sup> It was also customary to have the illegitimate sons of kings, known as *sogun* (minor gentlemen), ordained as monks.<sup>62</sup> Numerous examples suggest that these aristocratic monks enjoyed many privileges. The *sogun*, for example, were automatically granted the fourth rank in the hierarchy of the Saṃgha bureaucracy and were given prestigious abbacies.<sup>63</sup> Normal monks could only attain this grade after passing a monastic examination and then trying to get promotion to higher ranks. Yet even normal monks were usually from influential or lower aristocratic families. A survey of monks' biographies from the early Koryô period has revealed that all were either related to the royal family or were sons of senior officials or local power-holders.<sup>64</sup> Perhaps commoners who met all the legal requirements

and managed to pass the ordination test were also regarded as proper monks, but they would have found it very difficult to climb the ladder of the monastic bureaucracy, a prerequisite for becoming abbot or gaining any other influential position. One can surmise that they made up the body of ordinary monks, perhaps corresponding to the middle category in Yi Kok's tri-partite system, but it is also possible that many if not most commoners had no option but to become monks' disciples.

### Conclusion

Legislation targeting Buddhist monks drawn up during the Koryô dynasty thus seems a clear example of the state asserting its higher authority over religious affairs. The restrictions imposed on entry to the Saṃgha were evidently designed to safeguard the pillars of state power, i.e. the tax system and the army. The restrictions concerning the number of men in a household who could join the Saṃgha are not strictly incompatible with the Vinaya, which specified that a candidate-monk should dispose freely of his person: if someone had a duty towards the state, it could be argued that he did not dispose freely of his person. However, the legal discrimination against people living in certain areas, which apparently encompassed most of the lower strata of Koryô society, clearly went against the spirit of the Vinaya.

Legislation concerning the conduct of monks seems to confirm the superiority of the state authority. Yet we should remember that in the Buddhist theory of kingship, a ruler was entitled to enforce the community's common law, the Vinaya, if its members transgressed it. The Koryô rulers tried to enforce adherence to the Vinaya, but did not use infractions against the rules as a pretext to obstruct or persecute the religious. On the contrary, their attitude towards transgressions was extremely lenient. This can be seen in the absence of any serious punishment for offenders. In Tang China, the legal codes specified that if a monk drank alcohol or ate meat or other proscribed foods, he would be sentenced to hard labour. For riding a horse, the punishment was laicisation.<sup>65</sup> Perhaps the Koryô legal code provided for similarly harsh measures,

source materials are funerary stelae, which do not give a representative picture of the Koryô Saṃgha as they were only erected for the most eminent monks, and epitaphs, which appear only from the mid- to late-eleventh century onward.

<sup>65</sup> Kenneth Ch'en, *The Chinese Transformation*, pp.97, 102.

<sup>59</sup> Edward L. Shultz, 'Institutional Developments in Korea under the Ch'oe House: 1196-1258' (PhD dissertation, University of Hawaii 1976).

<sup>60</sup> See KRSC 10: 27b, where the monks' disciples are employed in the construction of P'yôngyang's defences; KRS 133: 24a-b, where they are employed in the building of military vessels.

<sup>61</sup> *Songshi* 489, Beijing 1977, p.14,054. See also Sem Vermeersch, 'The Power of Buddha', pp.183-93.

<sup>62</sup> KRS 39: 14b. The entry for the year 1356: 'since the time of our ancestral king, the children of [the king and] a commoner concubine were forced to become monk to make a clear distinction between the legal consort and commoner [concubines].'

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.* 90: 31a.

<sup>64</sup> Sem Vermeersch, 'The Power of Buddha', pp.194-5. However, our only

but the sources are silent about the type of punishment. The repeated ban on the consumption and brewing of alcohol, as well as the many descriptions of drunken monks, suggest that the punishments were either not very harsh or not enforced. The legislation even gives the impression that, to a large degree, monks were above the law. The fact that they could routinely avail themselves of horses and lodgings at postal stations shows that their power was on a par with civil officials and that they were regarded as representatives of central authority. Perhaps this applied not to the general rank and file, but to those monks who were part of the monastic bureaucracy.<sup>66</sup>

Although the legal framework dealing with Buddhists was clearly inspired by a Chinese example, there is little evidence of the discrimination and bias against the foreign religion underpinning similar laws in China. This indicates that the authorities could not or would not intervene at will in the affairs of the Saṃgha, which must therefore have enjoyed considerable power and autonomy. The gap between the letter of the law and actual practice is perhaps best illustrated by the existence of a special semi-legal class of monks, the monks' disciples. By fulfilling corvée duties for temples, ordinary people could circumvent the ordination restrictions and join the Saṃgha. Their ambiguous status between secular and religious is perhaps a better indication of the actual state of affairs: nominally the law was respected, as they could not be fully ordained, but in reality the monasteries prevailed, because they could dispose of a vast reserve of people who fulfilled corvée labour and military services for them.

### Appendix: Translated source material

#### A. Munjong's decree of 1056 (*Koryôsa* 7: 40a-b)

The teaching of the Buddha puts purity first, and distances itself from defilements in order to get rid of desire. Now there are many disciples [of monks] who call themselves *śramaṇa* to avoid corvée labour. They prosper, win possessions and have a livelihood; they engage in agriculture or trade. They go against the word of the Vinaya and

disavow the rules of purity. The cassock draped over their shoulder is used to hide a wine-jar, while the place for lecturing and chanting is misused as a plot for growing garlic and onions.<sup>67</sup> In the course of their engagement in trade, they play and drink with guests. Their noise upsets the flower court and their stench spoils the bath-tub. They wear secular hats and clothes. On the pretext of repairing the temples, they raise the banner and beat the drum, sing songs and play the flute. They come and go in commoners' homes, behave impudently in markets and squares and pick fights to inflict wounds. Therefore, we want to separate good and evil, and to purify and regulate we need to sift and reduce the numbers. Among the temples of the capital and the provinces, we will let those who practise diligently and uphold the rules stay in peace, but the offenders will be dealt with according to the [secular] law.

#### B. Yun Kwan's memorial of 1104 (*Koryôsa* 81: 12b-13a)

Also, [we should] choose monk-disciples for the Demon-subduing Army [*Hangmagun*]. [Since] the beginning of the dynasty, all the temples have had monastery dependents who usually fulfil labour duty, just as the people from the prefectures and counties. A large number of them, running to thousands, are normally productive [i.e. they farm for their living]. Whenever the country has to raise an army, we should also recruit monastery dependents and attach them to the army.

#### C. Xu Jing's description of the *zaijia heshang* (*Gaoli tujing* 18)

[They] never wear the *kāśāya*, and do not adhere to the rules. They wear tight-fitting clothes of coarse white hemp, tied with a black silken sash around the waist. They go barefoot, but sometimes there is one who wears shoes. They build houses for themselves, take spouses and have children. Publicly they are engaged in carrying utensils on their back, sweeping the roads, building and maintaining drains and ditches, repairing and building walls and houses, they are always devoted to their work. When the

<sup>66</sup> On the monastic bureaucracy, see Sem Vermeersch, 'The Power of Buddha', chapters 4, 5.

<sup>67</sup> Monks were not allowed to eat the so-called 'five strong-smelling plants', including garlic and onions, as these were thought to arouse sexual passion. See Kenneth Ch'en, *The Chinese Transformation*, pp.97-8.



alarm is sounded at the borders, then they are banded together in groups. Although they are not fit for cavalry, they are strong and brave. When they march with the army they carry their own provisions; without paying for them, the country can still wage a war. I have heard that when the Khitan were defeated by the Koryô, it was thanks to them. In fact they fulfil corvée labour for the eunuchs [i.e. monks], but since their head is shaven the barbarians [i.e. Koreans] call them monks.<sup>68</sup>

**D. Entries on Buddhism from the 'Treatise on judicial law 2' (*Koryôsa* 85: 6a-24b)**

No date:

It is forbidden for people of households registered in villages [*hyang*], boroughs [*pugok*], ferries, postal stations, the two border provinces and the military garrisons to become monks.

982, 6th month:

[Ch'oe Sûngno's memorial] Monks, when they travel through counties and prefectures, use the inns at postal stations, where they lash out at the attendants, blaming them for lazy service. The attendants do not know whether or not the monks are acting on royal command and do not dare to protest. This is a great injustice, and henceforth monks and their disciples [*sûngdo*] should be forbidden to stay at postal inns. Many secular people build Buddhist temples as they see fit under the pretext of planting good karma. Their number is exceedingly high, and there are many monks and disciples of the capital and outside who are eager to construct [more temples]. They urge the functionaries of the provinces and prefectures to draft people [for these projects], thus putting strain on the official corvée labourers. The people are suffering, and I request a strong prohibition... Towards the end of Silla, gold and sil-

<sup>68</sup> Xu Jing, *Gaoli tujing*, Seoul 1997, pp.193-4. The last sentence is rather puzzling. I suppose that 'eunuch' is a metonym for monks, as they were both 'disabled', the one technically and the other by an act of faith, and that Xu Jing here wants to say that they were erroneously called monks (*heshang*) by the Koreans because they served monks and shaved their heads.

ver was used to make sūtras and images. This excessive luxury led to the downfall of Silla. Merchants then destroyed the Buddhist images to sell the gold and silver and thus make [these resources] productive. Recently, remnants of these practices have become apparent, and I wish they would be forbidden.

1010:

It is forbidden for monks' slaves to fight with each other; it is also forbidden for monks and nuns to brew wine.

1012:

A letter of instruction said: 'the dress of śramaṇas is seen to become more and more luxurious, no different from secular dress. We order officials to determine a dress standard.'

1017, 1st month:

People are again forbidden to decorate their house as a temple and make spouses or daughters become nuns.

1021, 6th month:

The Censorate requested that monks from all temples should be forbidden to drink wine and play music.

1027, 8th month:

Monks are forbidden to wear white robes, leggings, silk gauze reins [?], silk gowns, leather shoes, coloured caps, conical bamboo hats or hat straps.

1028, 2nd month:

A letter of instruction said: 'Monks and nuns cheat the ordinary people, they gather all kinds of assets and transport them with horses of the postal stations, causing great damage. Officials should be ordered to forbid this.'

1101, 6th month:

[A decree said:] 'We forbid monks and nuns to gather and mingle in a Myriad-Buddha assembly, and to donate their house as a temple.'

1131, 6th month:

The Divination Commission put forward a proposal: 'Recently, monks and lay people have been gathering freely in events they call "Myriad Buddha Fragrant Following", some chant the Buddha's name and read sūtras, but they are only feigning and bragging; some of the monks and their disciples [*sungdo*] sell wine and onions; some take up arms to commit crimes, they dance around and play games in a chaotic and vulgar manner. Please let the Censorate, the brigade and the inspectors forbid this.' A decree approved the proposal.

1188, 3rd month:

Monks illegally claim tribute households and free farmers for their agricultural estates, and force inferior paper or cloth [loans] on the people to reap interests; this should be forbidden.

1260, 2nd month:

It is forbidden... for monks not to wear the right kind of bamboo hat.

1276, 6th month:

Unless for a memorial service for a parent it is forbidden to go to temples.

1288, 4th month:

[The investigating censor reported]: 'As for monks and disciples [*sungdo*] and slaves, servants and the like, when they ride horses and travel the official roads without caution, sometimes a pedestrian gets killed; henceforth a constable should arrest and imprison them and the culprit should be punished.'

1307:

Monks are forbidden to wear snow-hats of bamboo; monks of the Great Sôn Master and Great Virtue ranks and above should wear eight-sided T-shaped bamboo hats or conical bamboo hats; offenders will be punished.

1312, 9th month:

A directorate to inspect monks is established; monasteries are forbidden to urge people to become monks, to gather

in the capital, to amass wealth and to engage in improper activities.

1316, 3rd month:

Monks and those in office are forbidden to engage in trading activities.

1325, 2nd month:

[A letter of instruction said]: 'As for provincial and county functionaries who have three children, none [of these children] is allowed to shave his head and be ordained as a monk. If there are more children, he has to report to the authorities to get a monk's certificate and can then ordain one child as monk. In cases where this regulation is not followed, both the child and the parents will be punished.'

1339, 5th month:

[The investigating censor submitted a list of prohibitions]: 'Recently, abbots of Sôn and Kyo temples have been making profits from their lands, using them exclusively and aggressively to repair ruined temples, in some cases resorting to corrupt practices. This disgrace should be forbidden. Also, women from the city, without regard for age or status, form groups of "incense followers" and go to mountain temples to prepare meals or light the lanterns. Some get intimate with monks, and commoners among them commit a crime by bearing their sons, while *yangban* families commit a crime by becoming their spouses. Also, monks should not be allowed to stay in commoners' houses and distribute proselytising tracts.'

1356, 6th month:

According to a letter of instruction, functionaries of villages and postal stations as well as public and private slaves are systematically dodging their tax and corvée duties by claiming to be monks. Households are decreasing by the day, and henceforth those without a monk's certificate should not be allowed private ordination.

1359, 12th month:

People are forbidden to appropriate the status of monk or nun.



1361:

The Censorate forbids monks to enter markets.

1386, 8th month:

Monks are forbidden to ride horses. Royal and state preceptors are allowed to ride a donkey.

1391:

Women are forbidden to go to temples.

Sem Vermeersch  
(Keimyung University,  
Daegu, S. Korea)

Abbreviations:

- KMC *Koryô myônghyônjip*, Sōnggyungwan Ch'ulp'anbu ed., Seoul 1973  
 KRS *Koryôsa*, Asea Munhwasa ed., Seoul 1972.  
 KRSC *Koryôsa chôryo*, Asea Munhwasa ed., Seoul 1981.  
 TMS *Tongmunson*, T'aehaksa ed., Seoul 1975.

THE *PĀRĀJIKĀ* PRECEPTS FOR NUNS

ANN HEIRMAN

The Buddhist monastic discipline is based on a list of precepts, *prātimokṣa*, and on a set of formal procedures, *karmavācanā*. The precepts are introduced and commented upon in the *vibhaṅgas* (*bhikṣuvibhaṅga*, chapter for monks; *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*, chapter for nuns). The first group of precepts mentioned in the *prātimokṣa* are the *pārājika* precepts. A violation of any of these leads to a definitive, lifetime exclusion from the Buddhist Community.

In all the Vinayas,<sup>1</sup> four *pārājika* precepts are common to both monks and nuns<sup>2</sup>:

<sup>1</sup> Five Vinayas survive in a Chinese translation: the Mahāśāsakavinaya (T 1421, MśVin), the Mahāsaṃghikavinaya (T 1425, MāVin), the Dharmaguptakavinaya (T 1428, DhVin), the Sarvāstivādavinaya (T 1435, SaVin) and the Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya (T 1428 up to and including T 1451, MūVin [because of its size, the Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya is not edited into one work but consists of a number of different works]). Closely related to the Mahāsaṃghikavinaya is the *bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga* (*bhivibh*) of the Mahāsaṃghika-Lokottaravādins (Mā-L), a text written in a transitional language between Prakṛit and Sanskrit. Apart from these texts, the Vinaya transmitted by the Theravāda school survives in the Pāli language. Finally, many Sanskrit fragments of Vinaya texts have been found.

<sup>2</sup> The Pāli chapter for nuns does not mention the precepts common to both monks and nuns. The first four *pār.* precepts for nuns are explained in the chapter for monks: *The Vinaya Piṭakam* (Vin), ed. H. Oldenberg, PTS, London, 1964 ed., III, pp.1-109. They are, however, enumerated in the *Bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣa* (Bhīpra; Pāli, *bhikkhūnī-pātimokkha*): M. Wijayarātne, *Les moniales bouddhistes, naissance et développement du monachisme féminin*, Paris 1991, p.172.

MśVin, *bhikṣuvibhaṅga* (*bhuvibh*), pp.1a7-10a29; *bhivibh*, pp.77b27-78a3; MāVin, *bhuvibh*, pp.227a7-262a11; *bhivibh*, pp.514a25-515a16; *bhivibh* of the Mā-L: *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya, Including Bhikṣuṇī-Prakīrṇaka and a Summary of the Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇaka of the Ārya-Mahāsaṃghika-Lokottaravādin* (= BhīVin (Mā-L), ed. G. Roth, Patna 1970, pp.74-80, §§111-17; a *bhuvibh* is not extant; DhVin, *bhuvibh*, pp.568c6-579a9; *bhivibh*, pp.714a6-715a5; the SaVin does not mention the precepts common to both monks and nuns. The first four *pār.*

- one may not indulge in sexual intercourse (*maithuna*),
- one may not steal (anything with a value of five coins or more),
- one may not take human life,
- one may not lie about one's spiritual achievements.

In every school, the set of precepts for nuns adopts the above four precepts for monks.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, contrary to the precepts seen as peculiar to nuns, the Vinayas neither introduce them nor give any commentary.<sup>4</sup> In addition all the Vinayas have four *pārājika* precepts considered to be peculiar to nuns:

- 1)<sup>5</sup> a nun may not have physical contact with a man below the armpit and above the knee<sup>6</sup>
- 2)<sup>7</sup> there are eight things that a nun may not do together with a man (all these things concern physical contact)

precepts are explained in the *bhuvibh*, pp.1a8-13c19. They are enumerated in the Bhīpra, T 1437, p.479b29-c16; MūVin, *bhuvibh*, pp.627c23-680b12; T1443, *bhivibh*, pp.907c24-929a22.

<sup>3</sup> See also U. Hüsken, *Die Vorschriften für die buddhistische Nonnengemeinde im Vinaya-Piṭaka der Theravādin*, Berlin 1997, pp.65-6, and p.66, n.118.

<sup>4</sup> The MāVin, the *bhivibh* of the Mā-L and the DhVin, however, add some commentary peculiar to nuns to the first *pārājika*. The MūVin, *bhivibh*, contains a summary of the introduction and commentary of the *bhuvibh* for all four precepts.

<sup>5</sup> Pāli Vin IV, pp.211-15; MśVin, p.78a3-b1; MāVin, p.515a17-c24; *bhivibh* of the Mā-L, BhīVin(Mā-L), pp.81-8; §§118-25; DhVin, pp.715a6-716a5; SaVin, pp.302c16-303c1; MūVin, T1443, pp.929a28-930b5.

<sup>6</sup> Pāli Vin IV, p.213: below the collarbone and above the knee; MśVin, p.78a27: below the rim of the hair of the head, above the knee and behind the elbow; MāVin, p.515c4: below the shoulder and above the knee; *bhivibh* in BhīVin(Mā-L), p.84, §123 and DhVin, p.715b7: below the armpit and above the knee; SāVin, p.303a21-22: below the rim of the hair of the head and above the knee; MūVin, T 1443, p.930a9-10: below the eyes and above the knee.

<sup>7</sup> Pāli Vin IV, pp.220-2 (in this Vinaya, this *pār.* precept is the last); MśVin, p.781b1-22; MāVin, pp.515c25-516b3; *bhivibh* in BhīVin(Mā-L), pp.88-91, §§126-30; DhVin, p.716a6-b23; SaVin, pp.303c2-304a6; MūVin, p.930b6-c27.

- 3)<sup>8</sup> a nun may not conceal a grave offence of another nun
- 4)<sup>9</sup> a nun may not follow (=imitate/help) a monk suspended by the Order (*saṃgha*).

The aim of this paper is to investigate how these four precepts peculiar to nuns have come into being. We will show that three of them have been extracted from the Bhikṣuprātimokṣa (Bhupra) and that one precept is probably to be seen as an addition to preceding precepts. In this way the *pārājikas* have been doubled in accordance with the tradition that a nun has to observe twice as many precepts.<sup>10</sup>

### 1. Physical contact<sup>11</sup>

The first *pārājika* precept peculiar to nuns says that a nun may not have physical contact with a man. While for a nun, physical contact is a *pārājika*, for a monk it is a *saṃghāvaśeṣa*,<sup>12</sup> specifically *saṃghāvaśeṣa* 2: a monk who has physical contact with a woman

<sup>8</sup> Pāli Vin IV, pp.216-17 (in this Vinaya, this *pār.* precept is the second peculiar to nuns); MśVin, pp.78c19-79a10 (here, this is the last *pār.* precept); MāVin, p.516b3-c24; *bhivibh* in BhīVin(Mā-L), pp.91-6, §§131-3; DhVin, pp.716b24-717a21; SaVin, pp.304a7-305c21; MūVin, T 1443, pp.930c28-931a19.

<sup>9</sup> Pāli Vin IV, pp.218-20 (in this Vin., this is the third *pār.* precept peculiar to nuns); MśVin, p.78b23-c19 (here, this is the seventh *pār.* precept); MāVin, pp.516c25-517b25; *bhivibh* in BhīVin(Mā-L), pp.96-101, §§134-7; DhVin, pp.717a22-718a29; SaVin, pp.305c22-307a2; MūVin, T1443, p.931a20-b29.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. E. Waldschmidt, *Bruchstücke des Bhikṣuṇī-Prātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādin mit einer Darstellung der Überlieferung des Bhikṣuṇī-Prātimokṣa in den Verschiedenen Schulen*, Leipzig 1926, p.1 (cf. *Wei-shu* [Dynastic History of the Wei, 386-557 CE], p.336b28-29); Z. Tsukamoto, *A History of Early Chinese Buddhism From Its Introduction to the Death of Hui-yüan*, translated from Japanese [*Chūgoku Bukkyō Tsūshi*, 1979] by L. Hurvitz, Tokyo, New York, San Francisco 1985, I, p.426 and pp.636-41, n.17 (cf. T 2145, *Ch'u San-tsang Chi-chi* [catalogue completed in 518 CE; containing much material from earlier catalogues that are now lost], pp.81b25-c2, 81c6-8 and 82a7-15 [notes written by Chu Fa-t'ai (320-387 CE)]).

<sup>11</sup> *kāyasaṃsarga* (Waldschmidt, *op. cit.*, p.72).

<sup>12</sup> I.e. an offence leading to a temporary suspension from the Order.



commits a *saṃghāvaśeṣa*.<sup>13</sup> The relation between these two precepts is explicitly referred to in the DhVin: the commentary following upon the *pārājika* for nuns says that a monk [in a similar case] commits a *saṃghāvaśeṣa*;<sup>14</sup> the commentary following upon the *saṃghāvaśeṣa* for monks says that a nun [in a similar case] commits a *pārājika*.<sup>15</sup>

All the precepts are said to have been stipulated by the Buddha. He only lays down a precept if the circumstances impel him to do so. In the case of the above *pārājika* for nuns and *saṃghāvaśeṣa* for monks, we twice have a very similar precept. It is very unlikely that the latter have been laid down independently, as a result of distinct circumstances. In all probability, one is based upon the other. Furthermore, it is a generally known fact that the Order of nuns only came into being when the Order of monks had already been established for some time. Therefore, the fifth *pārājika* for nuns is most probably based upon the second *saṃghāvaśeṣa* for monks.<sup>16</sup>

## 2. Eight things<sup>17</sup>

The second *pārājika* precept for nuns forbids them to do eight things together with a man.<sup>18</sup> The order and content of the eight things, however, differ from Vinaya to Vinaya. The following chart displays which Vinaya enumerates which things and in which

<sup>13</sup> Pāli Vin III, p.120; MśVin, p.11a25-27; MāVin, p.265c20-22; DhVin, p.580 b28-29; SaVin, p.15a14-15; MūVin, T 1442, p.683b29-c2.

<sup>14</sup> DhVin, p.716a1-2, literally says: *Bhikṣu saṃghāvaśeṣa; śikṣamāṇā, śrāmaṇera, śrāmaṇerī duṣkṛta* (a monk *saṃghāvaśeṣa*; a probationer, a male novice and a female novice *duṣkṛta*). A *duṣkṛta*, lit. 'a bad action', refers to a very light offence.

<sup>15</sup> DhVin, p.581a20-21, literally says: *Bhikṣuṇī pārājika; śikṣamāṇā, śrāmaṇera, śrāmaṇerī duṣkṛta*.

<sup>16</sup> This implies that, with regard to physical contact, a woman is judged more severely than a man, certainly in respect of the region between the armpit and the knee (see n.6; – cf. Hüsken, *op. cit.*, pp.46-50, 67).

<sup>17</sup> Pāli *atthavathukā* (Waldschmidt, *op. cit.*, p.76).

<sup>18</sup> Only if she does all eight things does she commit a *pārājika* (see also Hüsken, *op. cit.*, pp.60-5).

order<sup>19</sup>:

| thing <sup>20</sup> | Pāli Vin | MśVin | MāVin | Mā-L | DhVin | SaVin | MūVin |
|---------------------|----------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| T1                  | 1        | 1     | 3     | 3    | 1     | 1     | /     |
| T2                  | 2        | 2     | 4     | 4    | 2     | 2     | /     |
| T3                  | 7        | /     | /     | /    | 3     | 6     | /     |
| T4                  | 3        | 5     | /     | /    | 4     | 3     | /     |
| T5                  | 4        | 6     | 2     | 2    | 5     | 4     | /     |
| T6                  | /        | 4     | /     | /    | 6     | /     | /     |
| T7                  | /        | 8     | 7     | 7    | 7     | /     | /     |
| T8                  | 5        | 3     | 8     | 8    | 8     | 5     | /     |
| T9                  | 6        | /     | /     | /    | /     | /     | /     |
| T10                 | 8        | /     | /     | /    | /     | /     | /     |
| T11                 | /        | 7     | /     | /    | /     | /     | /     |
| T12                 | /        | /     | 1     | 1    | /     | /     | /     |
| T13                 | /        | /     | 5     | 5    | /     | /     | /     |
| T14                 | /        | /     | 6     | 6    | /     | /     | /     |
| T15                 | /        | /     | /     | /    | /     | 7     | /     |
| T16                 | /        | /     | /     | /    | /     | 8     | /     |

<sup>19</sup> We compare all the Vinayas with the DhVin, the most important of them in East Asia. Therefore, things 1 up to and including 8 coincide with the order and content of the eight things in this Vinaya.

<sup>20</sup> T1: a man holds the hand of a nun; T2: a man grasps the robes of a nun; T3: a nun goes with a man to a secret place; T4: a nun stands together with a man; T5: a nun talks with a man; T6: a nun walks together with a man; T7: a nun and a man lean against each other; T8: a nun makes appointments with a man; T9: a nun allows a man to approach (she is within reach of a man's hand); T10: a nun disposes her body (within reach of a man's hand); T11: a nun sits together with a man; T12: a nun stays within reach of a man's hand; T13: a nun is happy when a man comes; T14: a nun invites a man to sit down; T15: a nun waits till a man comes; T16: a nun offers her body just like a woman in white clothes (a lay woman at home), i.e. she does not protest against the intentions of a man when he reaches for her or embraces her; T17: a nun moves back and forth together with a man; T18: a nun makes fun together with a man; T19: a nun laughs together with a man; T20: a nun indicates a place (where they can meet each other); T21: a nun agrees on a time (to meet each other); T22: a nun wears a sign (to inform a man that she is ready to see him); T23: a nun allows a man to visit her as if he were her husband; T24: a nun lies down on a place where one can do inappropriate actions.

|     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T17 | / | / | / | / | / | / | 1 |
| T18 | / | / | / | / | / | / | 2 |
| T19 | / | / | / | / | / | / | 3 |
| T20 | / | / | / | / | / | / | 4 |
| T21 | / | / | / | / | / | / | 5 |
| T22 | / | / | / | / | / | / | 6 |
| T23 | / | / | / | / | / | / | 7 |
| T24 | / | / | / | / | / | / | 8 |

Although the eight things all concern physical contact, the relatively major differences are remarkable, the more so since it concerns one of the most important precepts. In view of the fact, however, that the Vinayas are very similar in respect of the contents of the *pārājika* precepts, but much less so in respect of the circumstances in which the offences are committed or in respect of the mitigating circumstances and the exceptions that they allow,<sup>21</sup> we can understand the difference concerning the 'eight things': rather than a new precept, the 'eight things' are a further extension of a preceding topic, already treated in the first and fifth *pārājika* precepts.<sup>22</sup> The different schools develop this extension in a relatively individual way. Extending a topic also explains why there is no corresponding precept for monks. The 'eight things' do not in fact constitute a separate precept, but are an enumeration of circumstances involving physical contact. Consequently, the DhVin gives no precise punishment for a monk, but only says that he has to be judged according to the circumstances.<sup>23</sup>

### 3 Concealment of a grave offence<sup>24</sup>

The third *pārājika* precept peculiar to nuns says that she may not conceal a grave offence of another nun. Except for the SaVin, each Vinaya explains a grave offence as a *pārājika*:

<sup>21</sup> See A.Heirman, *The Discipline in Four Parts, Rules for Nuns according to the Dharmaguptakavinaya*, Delhi 2002, Part I, pp.124-7.[See review on pp.211.]

<sup>22</sup> Therefore, the Vinayas, except for the MūVin, barely introduce this precept.

<sup>23</sup> Cf.DhVin, p.716b12-13 (lit.): A bhikṣu is in accordance with the offence that he has committed; *śikṣamāṇā, śrāmaṇera, śrāmaṇeri duṣkṛta*.

<sup>24</sup> *duṣṭhulāpraticchādana* (Waldschmidt, *op.cit.* p.21).

- Pāli Vin IV, pp.216-17, *pār.* 2: a nun conceals a *pār.* of a nun
- MśVin, p.79a1-5, *pār.* 8: a nun conceals a *pār.* of a nun.
- MāVin, p.516b25-28, *pār.* 7: a nun conceals a grave offence of a nun; p.516b29-c1 = a *pār.*
- *Bhivibh* of the Mā-L in BhīVin(Mā-L), pp.93-4, §132: a nun conceals a grave offence of a nun; = a *pār.*
- DhVin, pp.716c29-717a4, *pār.* 7: a nun conceals a *pār.* of a nun.
- SaVin, p.304a22-27, *pār.* 7: a nun conceals a grave offence of a nun; p.304a28-29 = a *pār.* or a *saṃ*.
- MūVin, T 1443, p.931a11-14, *pār.* 7: a nun conceals a *pār.* of a nun.

This *pārājika* precept is not an original one, since it is related to a *pācittika* precept<sup>25</sup> for monks appearing in all the Vinayas. This relation is explicitly referred to in the DhVin, namely in the commentary following upon the *pārājika* precept for nuns: a monk (who conceals the grave offence of a monk) commits a *pācittika* (p.717a16-17).<sup>26</sup> Except for the MśVin, all the Vinayas explain a grave offence as a *pārājika* or a *saṃghāvaśeṣa*:

- Pāli Vin IV, p.127, *pāc.* 64: a monk conceals a grave offence of a monk; p.128 = a *pār.* or a *saṃ*.
- MśVin, p.67a26-27, *pāc.* 74: a monk conceals a grave offence of a monk, without any further commentary.
- MāVin, pp.376c29 p.377a1, *pāc.* 60: a monk conceals a grave offence of a monk; p.377a1-2 = a *pār.* or a *saṃ*.
- DhVin, p.679a5-6, *pāc.* 64: a monk conceals a grave offence of a monk; p.679a6-7 = a *pār.* or a *saṃ*.
- SaVin, p.102c16-17, *pāc.* 50: a monk conceals a grave offence of a monk; p.102c18 = a *pār.* or a *saṃ*.
- MūVin, T 1442, p.834a6-7, *pāc.* 50: a monk conceals a grave offence of a monk; p.834a9-10 = a *pār.* or a *saṃ*.

Given the above data, we can conclude that, generally speak-

<sup>25</sup> I.e. a precept the violation of which leads to the expiation of the offence.

<sup>26</sup> DhVin, p.717a16-17, literally says: *Bhikṣu pācittika; śikṣamāṇā, śrāmaṇera, śrāmaṇeri duṣkṛta*.



ing, a nun commits a *pārājika* if she conceals a *pārājika* of another nun, while a monk commits a *pācittika* if he conceals a *pārājika* or a *saṃghāvaśeṣa* of another monk. This conclusion reveals two facts: first, for a nun, the concealment of a *pārājika* offence is considered to be more serious than for a monk; secondly, the two precepts are not totally parallel: the *bhīvibh* does not mention the concealment of a *saṃghāvaśeṣa*. In this context, it is important to note that some schools have a second precept for nuns that concerns the concealment of an offence of another nun. Moreover, the DhVin, in the commentary following upon the *pācittika* precept for monks, explicitly refers to this second precept for nuns: a nun (who conceals the grave offence of a nun) commits a *pācittika* (p.679a14-15).<sup>27</sup> This precept is neither introduced nor commented upon<sup>4</sup> and belongs to those precepts that are explicitly copied from the Bhupra:

- DhVin, p.735c25-26, *pāc.* 49 : a nun conceals a grave offence of a nun ; in the corresponding *pāc.* 64 of the *bhuvibh*, a grave offence is explained as a *pār.* or a *saṃ.*
- Bhīpra of the Sarvāstivādins, T 1437, p.483b14-15, *pāc.* 35: a nun conceals a *saṃ.* of a nun.
- MūVin, T 1443, p.983c22-24, *pāc.* 35 : a nun conceals a grave offence of a nun ; p.983c25-26 = a *pār.* or a *saṃ.*

For nuns, the above *pācittika* precept creates an inconsistency in the set of precepts of the three above-mentioned schools:

- Dharmaguptaka school: *pār.* 7 says that a nun who conceals a *pār.* of a nun commits a *pār.*; *pāc.* 49 says that she commits a *pāc.* if she conceals a grave offence (*pār.* or *saṃ.*).
- Sarvāstivāda school: *pār.* 7 says that a nun who conceals a *pār.* or a *saṃ.* of a nun commits a *pār.*; *pāc.* 35 says that she commits a *pāc.* if she conceals a *saṃ.*
- Mūlasarvāstivāda School: *pār.* 7 says that a nun commits a *pār.* if she conceals a *pār.* of another nun; *pāc.* 35 says she commits a *pāc.* if she conceals a grave offence

<sup>27</sup> DhVin, p.679a14-15, literally says: *Bhikṣuṇī pācittika; śikṣamāṇā, śrāmaṇera, śrāmaṇerī duṣkṛta.*

(*pār.* or *saṃ.*).

The inconsistency is a result of the fact that one precept for monks (a monk commits a *pācittika* if he conceals a *pārājika* or a *saṃghāvaśeṣa* of another monk) has twice been copied into the set of precepts for nuns. However, when the precept was copied into the *pārājika* precepts for nuns, it was not copied in its totality: all the Vinayas, except for the SaVin, say that a nun only commits a *pārā-jika* if she conceals the *pārājika* of another nun. A *saṃghāvaśeṣa* is not mentioned. The concealment of a *saṃghāvaśeṣa* can thus very well be considered as a *pācittika* offence. Consequently, the irregularity in the three above-mentioned Vinayas can be removed in a very simple way:

- Dharmaguptaka school: in *bhīvibh*, *pāc.* 49, 'grave offence' should be replaced by *saṃghāvaśeṣa*: a nun commits a *pāc.* if she conceals a *saṃ.* of another nun; the commentary following the copied *bhuvibh*, *pāc.* 64 should specify that a nun commits a *pāc.* if she conceals the *saṃ.* of another nun, whereas she commits a *pār.* if she conceals a *pār.*
- Sarvāstivāda school: in accordance with the other schools, *bhīvibh*, *pār.* 7 should say that a nun commits a *pār.* only if she conceals a *pār.* of another nun (and not a *pār.* or a *saṃ.*).
- Mūlasarvāstivāda school: *bhīvibh*, *pāc.* 35, 'grave offence' should be explained as a '*saṃghāvaśeṣa*': a nun commits a *pāc.* if she conceals a *saṃ.* (and not a *pār.* or a *saṃ.*) of another nun.

Finally, it is to be noted that the set of precepts for nuns contains yet another precept involving the concealment of an offence of another nun: all the Vinayas stipulate that nuns who stay in each other's company, who have bad habits together, who spread a bad reputation and who conceal each other's offences, commit a *saṃghāvaśeṣa*.<sup>28</sup> Since, however, the concealment of a

<sup>28</sup> Pāli Vin IV, p.239, *saṃ.* 9; MśVin, p.82a23-b6, *saṃ.* 14; MāVin, p.522c23-28, *saṃ.* 17; *bhīvibh* in BhīVin(Mā-L), p.155, §170, *saṃ.* 17; DhVin, pp.723c29-724a7, *saṃ.* 14; SaVin, p.312a29-b9, *saṃ.* 16; MūVin, T1443, p.938c2-13, *saṃ.* 15.

*pārājika* offence constitutes a *pārājika* offence, the offences referred to in the *saṃghāvaśeṣa* precept for nuns can be of all kinds, except a *pārājika*.<sup>29</sup> This is explicitly stipulated in the commentary following upon the *saṃghāvaśeṣa* precept in MśVin and DhVin.<sup>30</sup> Further, the difference between the *saṃghāvaśeṣa* precept and the less serious *pācittika* precept involving the concealment of an offence (a *saṃ.*) of a nun as mentioned in three Vinayas is that in the *saṃghāvaśeṣa* precept the concealment is only one of several bad actions that together constitute a *saṃghāvaśeṣa* offence, while in the *pācittika* precept, it is the only bad action referred to.

#### 4. To follow a suspended monk<sup>31</sup>

The fourth *pārājika* precept peculiar to nuns says that a nun may not follow a suspended monk. 'To follow' is interpreted in two ways; the Pāli Vin understands it as to imitate the suspended one;<sup>32</sup> the MśVin, MāVin, the *bhīvibh* of the Mā-L, the DhVin, SaVin and MūVin understand it as to give help to the suspended one.<sup>33</sup> Again, this *pārājika* precept is not an original one, because it is related to a *pācittika* precept for monks: a monk who follows a suspended monk commits a *pācittika*.<sup>34</sup> In the DhVin, the commentary following upon the *pārājika* precept for nuns adds that a monk (who follows a suspended nun) commits a *duṣkṛta*.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>29</sup> See also Hüsken, *op. cit.*, pp.50-3, 99; Waldschmidt, *op. cit.*, p.98, n.3.

<sup>30</sup> MśVin, p.82b6-8; DhVin, p.724a18-19.

<sup>31</sup> *utksiptānuvṛtti* (to follow a suspended one; - Waldschmidt, *op. cit.*, p.78)

<sup>32</sup> Pāli Vin IV, p.219.

<sup>33</sup> MśVin, p.78b26 (in the introductory story); MāVin, p.517b14-15; *bhīvibh* in BhīVin(Mā-L), p.100, §136; DhVin, p.717c25-28; SaVin, p.306a25; MūVin, T 1443, p.931b7-20.

<sup>34</sup> Pāli Vin IV, p.137, *pāc.* 69; MśVin, p.57c3-5, *pāc.* 49; MāVin, pp.367c28-368a1, *pāc.* 46; SaVin, p.106c8-10, *pāc.* 56; MūVin, T 1442, p.841b17-18, *pāc.* 56: a monk follows a suspended monk; DhVin, p.683c2-4, *pāc.* 69: a monk follows a suspended one. - The *pāc.* precept for monks says that a monk has been suspended for not giving up wrong views; the *pār.* precept for nuns does not specify the reason for the suspension.

<sup>35</sup> DhVin, p.718a23-24, literally says: *Bhikṣu duṣkṛta; śikṣamāṇā, śrāmaṇera, śrāmaṇerī duṣkṛta*. - The earlier mentioned *pār.* 5 and 7 for nuns (in the

Besides the *pārājika* precept, the set of precepts for nuns contains another precept related to the same item: a nun who follows a suspended nun commits a *pācittika*.<sup>36</sup> This precept is neither introduced nor commented upon<sup>4</sup> and belongs to those precepts that are explicitly copied from the Bhupra, in this case from the precept saying that a monk who follows a suspended monk commits a *pācittika*. The relation between the latter two precepts is referred to in the MśVin and DhVin: the commentary following upon the *pācittika* precept for monks stipulates that a nun (who follows a suspended nun) commits a *pācittika*.<sup>37</sup>

As was the case for the previous *pārājika* precept for nuns, we again see that one precept for monks has been inserted twice into the set of precepts for nuns, once as a precept considered to be peculiar to nuns, and once as a precept in common with monks: a monk who follows a suspended monk commits a *pācittika* ≈ a nun who follows a suspended monk commits a *pārājika*; a nun who follows a suspended nun commits a *pācittika*.

DhVin), and their respectively corresponding *saṃ.* 2 and *pāc.* 64, reveal that 'bhikṣu duṣkṛta' has to be understood as 'a bhikṣu who follows a suspended nun commits a *duṣkṛta*': *pār.* 5: a nun may not have physical contact with a *man* ≈ *pāc.* 64: a monk may not have physical contact with a *woman* (see also n.14); *pār.* 7: a nun may not conceal a grave offence of another *nun* ≈ *pāc.* 64: a monk may not conceal a grave offence of another *monk* (see also n.26); by analogy: *pār.* 8: a nun may not follow a suspended *monk* ≈ *bhikṣu duṣkṛta*: 'a bhikṣu who follows a suspended *nun* commits a *duṣkṛta*'.

<sup>36</sup> Pāli Bhikkhunīpātimokkha, Wijayaratna, *op. cit.*, p.187, *pāc.* 147; MśVin, p.86a3-5, *pāc.* 34; Bhīpra of the Mahāsāṃghikas, T 1427, p.560c5-7, *pāc.* 36; Bhīpra of the Sarvāstivādins, T 1437, p.483c4-6, *pāc.* 41: a nun follows a suspended nun; DhVin, p.736a10-11, *pāc.* 53; MūVin, T 1443, p.987a6-7, *pāc.* 41: a nun follows a suspended one (the introductory story in MūVin says that a nun follows a monk; in this way, there is an overlap between *pāc.* 41 and *pār.* 8 that says that a nun who follows a monk commits a *pār.*).

<sup>37</sup> MśVin, p.57c8-9, literally says: *Bhikṣuṇī*, it is the same; *śikṣamāṇā, śrāmaṇera, śrāmaṇerī duṣkṛta*. DhVin, p.683c16-17, literally says: *Bhikṣuṇī pācittika; śikṣamāṇā, śrāmaṇera, śrāmaṇerī duṣkṛta*.



## Conclusion

The above data reveal that seven of the eight *pārājika* precepts for nuns are extracted from the set of precepts for monks. Four of these seven are *pārājika* precepts common to both monks and nuns: in the *bhīvibh*, they are neither introduced nor commented upon;<sup>4</sup> in some *bhīvibh*'s, they are not even mentioned.<sup>2</sup> One precept (physical contact) is copied from a *saṃghāvaśeṣa* precept for monks. Another (concealment of a grave offence) is extracted from a *pācittika* precept. In some schools, this *pācittika* precept has been adapted into the set for nuns a second time: to conceal a grave offence of another nun constitutes a *pārājika*; to conceal a grave offence of a monk constitutes a *pācittika*. The irregularities caused by the double appearance can be removed in a simple way. Lastly, one precept (to follow a suspended monk) is equally extracted from a *pācittika* precept. In addition, all the schools have adopted this *pācittika* precept a second time: to follow a suspended monk constitutes a *pārājika*; to follow a suspended nun constitutes a *pācittika*.

The remaining *pārājika* precept for nuns (the eight things) is not to be regarded as a newly introduced precept, but rather as a commentary on a preceding item.

In this way, the *pārājika* precepts have been doubled, in accordance with the tradition. It is to be noted, however, that, in spite of the tradition, in no Vinaya is the number of rules for nuns really twice the number of those for monks. In fact, it is only the case in two categories, namely the *pārājika* precepts (four for monks; eight for nuns) and the *pratideśanīya* precepts<sup>38</sup> (four for monks; eight for nuns<sup>39</sup>). This may point to some symbolic value attached to the number 'eight'. In this context, it is noteworthy that in two other fundamental issues for nuns, the number eight appears:

1) When the Buddha allows the first women to be ordained, he lays down eight fundamental rules (*gurudharma*) to be strictly observed by the Order of nuns. These rules stipulate the position and duties of the Order of nuns towards the Order of monks.<sup>40</sup>

2) As mentioned above, one of the *pārājika* precepts for nuns concerns eight things (of contact between a man and a woman).

Moreover, the tradition that the number of precepts for nuns is twice the number of those for monks is probably not of early origin. It only appears in later (Chinese) works, not in the Vinayas themselves.<sup>10</sup> The number 'eight', however, plays a prominent part in the rules for nuns and is even integrated into the account of the foundation of the nun's Order.

Ann Heirman  
Ghent University

<sup>38</sup> These are precepts on minor offences that have to be confessed.

<sup>39</sup> One Vinaya, i.e. the later finalised MūVin, has 11 *pratideśanīya* precepts for nuns (see A. Heirman, 'Vinaya: perpetuum mobile', *Études Asiatiques* LIII.4, 1999, pp.864-5).

<sup>40</sup> See further É. Nolot, *Règles de discipline des nonnes bouddhistes, le bhikkhūṇīvinaya de l'école Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin*, Paris 1991, pp.9-58 and 397-405; Hüsken, *op. cit.*, pp.345-60; Heirman, *The Discipline in Four Parts, op. cit.*, Part 1, pp.63-5.

*Paścāttāpaḥ* by DAVULDEṆA JÑANEŚVARA

edited and translated by

BHIKKHU TAMPALAWELA DHAMMARATANA and BHIKKHU PĀSĀDIKA

**Introductory Remarks**

Many authoritative publications on Sanskrit literature in Sri Lanka through the ages are due to H. Bechert<sup>1</sup> such as, for instance, his ‘Sanskrit Literature in Sri Lanka as a Paradigm of Regional Sanskrit Literatures’<sup>2</sup>. With regard to recent contemporary Sanskrit literature in Sri Lanka, the second editor / translator of the following verses of *Paścāttāpaḥ* published a ‘Poem in Praise of a Dog, Contemporary Sri Lankan Sanskrit Poetry: The *Śvānastavakāvya* by Davuldeṇa Jñāneśvara Mahāsthavira’.<sup>3</sup> In the introduction to the latter poem is given a biographical sketch of the author and also his major Sanskrit works are listed. Ven. Nāṇissara’s / Jñāneśvara’s poetry has been characterised as ‘exactly conforming to the rules and conventions of classical Sanskrit poetry’. The following piece in the form of a letter gives the impression of a valedictory poem of the author bidding farewell to his composing Sanskrit poetry.<sup>4</sup>

Of considerable interest is the fact that Ven. Nāṇissara’s *Paścāttāpaḥ* is a *lekha*, a didactic letter in verses, whereby the ancient

1 See the bibliography in: R. Grünendahl, J.-U. Hartmann and P. Kieffer-Pülz (eds.), *Studien zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde* (Prof. Heinz Bechert felicitation volume), Indica et Tibetica, Bonn 1993, pp. 5 f., 19 f., 23 f., 32, 35, and in: P. Kieffer-Pülz, J.-U. Hartmann (eds.), *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ*, Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday, Indica et Tibetica, Swisttal-Odendorf 1997, p. 22.

2 See O.H. de A. Wijesekera (ed.), *Malalasekera Commemoration Volume*, Colombo 1976, pp. 23-35.

3 In: D. Dimitrov, U. Roesler and R. Steiner (eds.), *Śikhisamuccaya*, Indian and Tibetan Studies (Collectanea Marpurgensia Indologica et Tibetica – Prof. Michael Hahn felicitation volume), Vienna 2002, pp. 129-49.

4 Nonetheless, shortly before the author’s composing *Paścāttāpaḥ*, his latest Sanskrit work came out: *Mahā-Mahendrakṣiṇāśravāgamanam*, Nugegoda 2002.



Buddhist epistolary literature is perpetuated. As for this genre, we are indebted to S. Dietz for a comprehensive study of the Buddhist epistolary literature of ancient India.<sup>5</sup> In her introduction she discusses the thematic structure of the *lekhas* by comparing it with that of the occidental epistolary literature in Latin. She observes a common structural pattern, although the structure of the *lekhas* is far less formalised than that of the letters in Latin.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, she mentions the structural features peculiar to letters written in Latin: a) *salutatio*, b) *intitulatio* (mentioning the sender), c) *inscriptio* (mentioning the addressee), d) *exordium* (introduction), e) *attentum facere* (drawing the addressee's attention), f) *benevolum facere* (winning the addressee's benevolence), g) *docilem facere* (arousing the addressee's interest in what is to be communicated), h) *conclusio* and i) *valedicere*.<sup>7</sup> Although Nāṇissara Mahāthera's *lekha* is rather short, it is not difficult to find the above-named structural elements in it. *Docilem facere* can, of course, be linked to one of the central Buddhist teachings of impermanence and the conclusions to be drawn from that fact, evidently the leitmotiv in *Paścāttāpaḥ*. This poem can perhaps be described as a model of concision and pathetic simplicity. Thus, for example, right at the beginning in verse 1 the *salutatio*, in Buddhist usage the praising of the Buddha or addressee, *exordium* and *benevolum facere* are combined. Presumably the somewhat abrupt ending in verse 15 shows the author's deliberate stylistic attempt to drive home the message of *anityatā* and *paścāttāpaḥ*. The verses of the poem are *śloka*s, here and there betraying some poetic licence in respect of metre, which fact, hopefully, does not render applicable to the present author and pundit what Urbain Chevreau wrote to a famous poet of his time:

'Lorsqu' un homme a vécu deux fois quarante hivers,  
Il ne doit plus penser aux vers,

Ni troubler son repos par d' inutiles peines...'<sup>8</sup>

*Paścāttāpaḥ*, written in Sinhala characters, is dated 6th Oct. 2002.

5 Siglinde Dietz, *Die buddhistische Briefliteratur Indiens*, Asiatische Forschungen Vol. 84, Wiesbaden 1984.

6 *Op. cit.*, p. 101 f.

7 *Ibid.*

8 *Annales poétiques depuis l' origine de la poésie française*, Tome XXVI, Paris 1783, p. 168.

## Paścāttāpaḥ Remorse

*bhavan Dharmaratna mitracarya* | Dear friend Dharmaratna,<sup>9</sup>

*lakṣmīr nirāmāyo dīrgham āyus ca bhavate bhavet* |  
*ratnatrayānubhāvena śāsanasyābhivṛddhaye* || 1 ||

1. May you – by the efficacy of the Triple Gem and for the sake of the [Buddhist] Teaching's thriving – be happy, healthy and long-lived.

*yāce bhavantam prastāvam piṣitāsthimaye mama* |  
*śarīre viśadīkartum daurbalyam jarayā kṛtam* || 2 ||

2. Please give me the opportunity of describing [how] old age has brought weakness on my body consisting of flesh and bones.

*bhojam bhojam piṣitam me pāyāṃ pāyāṃ ca*<sup>10</sup> *śonitam* |  
*neyam neyam kṛśatvam mām śīśleṣa yakṣiṇī jarā* || 3 ||

3. I am in the grip of the demonness of old age, more and more being reduced to emaciation; [she] does not stop eating<sup>11</sup> my flesh and drinking my blood.

*indriyāṇām balaṃ nāsti mama kutra gatā smṛtiḥ* |  
*vātāhatakadalīva vapuḥ samprati vepate* || 4 ||

4. The sense organs have lost their powers; where has gone my memory? Now my body shakes like a banana tree smitten by the wind.

<sup>9</sup> Lit.: 'O you, Dharmaratna, whose deportment is that of a friend'.

<sup>10</sup> MS: *pāyāṃ pāyāṃ ca*. Cf. O. Böhtlingk, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung*, St. Petersburg 1883-6, s.v. *pāyāṃ pāyāṃ*, 'unter beständigem Trinken'; reading *pāyāṃ*, 'being drunk', seems preferable.

<sup>11</sup> Lit.: '(my flesh) continually bestowing enjoyment'.

*muhur muhur vepamāno namraprṣṭhaśirodharah |*  
*daṇḍapāṇir vārdhako*<sup>12</sup> 'yam praskhalan nityam ācaret || 5 ||

5. Trembling again and again, with his back and neck bent, this old man will proceed, [though] leaning on his stick<sup>13</sup>, tottering all the time.

*asahyapīḍanam hastapādeṣu varīvrtyate |*  
*vāriṇi budbudānīva syandante svedavipruṣaḥ || 6 ||*

6. There is unbearable pain in his hands and feet, and beads of sweat pour forth like bubbles in water.

*yathendukāntiḥ kṛṣṇe drṣṭiśaktir anukramam |*  
*kṣayaty upacakṣuṣāpi*<sup>14</sup> *nāsti kiṃ cit*<sup>15</sup> *prayojanam || 7 ||*

7. Just as the brightness of the moon gradually wanes in the dark [half of the month, – even so he slowly loses his] sight, [and] spectacles are of no use any [more].

*śāśvasyate yathā bhastrā niṣṭhivati kṣaṇam kṣaṇam |*  
*jalotkṣipto yathā mīnaḥ pāṇir bhūyaḥ pravepate || 8 ||*

8. He pants like a bellows, [coughs and] spits every instant; his hand shakes very much like a [flapping] fish [when caught and] brought out of the water [on to the land].

*aho yauvanalakṣmīr mām kadā cit punar eti na |*  
*mukharaṅge 'dhunā vāṇi na nṛtyati yathepsitam || 9 ||*

9. Alas! The good fortune of youth will never return to me, and this time the goddess of speech does no [more] dance, as desired, on the stage of [my] mouth.

12 MS: *vārdhako*.

13 Lit.: 'staff-handed'.

14 MS: *°sāpi*.

15 MS: *kiṃ cit*.

*gatā matiḥ cyutā śaktir āyur yāti dinam prati |*  
*mṛtyur āsyam hi vyādāya sammukhe mama tiṣṭhati || 10 ||*

10. [My] remembrance is gone, [my] strength has vanished and [my] lifespan peters out day by day. The god of death is waiting in front of me, his jaws wide open.

*lekhanī lekhanāgāre viśrāntā phalakopari |*  
*viprahīṇā kāvyacintā rekheva rekhitā*<sup>16</sup> *jale || 11 ||*

11. In [my] study<sup>17</sup> on the [writing] desk the pen has taken leave<sup>18</sup> and, like a line drawn on water, [my] thinking about poetical composition has disappeared.

*aśrāntam pathitā granthāḥ śerate pustakālaye |*  
*parāmṛśanti tām adya kṛmayo mūṣikā api || 12 ||*

12. Tirelessly studied [before], nowadays the books in the library are [fast] asleep, being the playground<sup>19</sup> of insects and mice.

*sarve kṣayāntāḥ*<sup>20</sup> *samsāre naivātmāpi bhavatrāye |*  
*muniṣṭhāḥ kaivalyam akṣayam hi kadā cana || 13 ||*

13. Everything<sup>21</sup> in the round of rebirths ends in destruction, and in the three [realms of] existence<sup>22</sup> there is no [lasting]

16 The v.l. of *lekhitā*.

17 Lit.: 'writing house'.

18 Lit.: 'taking rest, coming to an end'.

19 Lit.: 'insects... touch.'

20 MS: *°antā*.

21 I.e. *sarve dharmāḥ*.

22 I.e. *kāmadhātu* (the worlds of desire), *rūpa°* (of form) and *ārūpya°* (of formlessness).



self whatsoever. [Only] Nirvāṇa<sup>23</sup>, to be sure, [as] the Sage has declared, is never at any time [subject to] destruction.

*paścāttāpo varīvarṭti smarato yauvanasya me |  
śoṣucyate hanta – yathā bhagnapucchajaraḍgavaḥ || 14 ||*

14. Alas! Just as an old ox grieves so much over its broken tail<sup>24</sup>, – [even so] regret prevails when [I] call to mind my youth.

*ā janmano 'śītisaptavārṣiko jarayā hataḥ |  
itaḥ paraṃ kathaṃ kuryāt padyabandhaṃ rasātmakam || 15 ||*

15. Being eighty-seven years old<sup>25</sup>, age has struck him down; how could he compose elegant poetry thereafter?

**Davuldeṇa Jñāneśvara Sthaviraḥ**

## THE GREAT PERFECTION AND THE CHINESE MONK: RNYING-MA-PA DEFENCES OF HWA-SHANG MAHĀYĀNA IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

SAM VAN SCHAİK

### 1. *Simultaneism, gradualism and polemics*

A controversy over two apparently opposed approaches to enlightenment runs throughout the history of Tibetan Buddhist thought. Broadly stated, the first position, 'the simultaneous approach' (*cig car gyi 'jug pa*) was that the cessation of dualistic conceptualisation in meditation was sufficient cause for enlightenment, without any need for the graduated and much more lengthy practices of the six *pāramitās*. On the other hand, the second position, 'the gradual approach' (*rim gyis 'jug pa*) was that those practices were indispensable.

The conflict between these two approaches was, according to Tibetan tradition, settled in the eighth century in a formal debate. Whether the debate actually occurred as such has been called into doubt, but there is no question of the importance of the legend of the debate to the Tibetan tradition. According to the Tibetan histories, the debate was arranged in bSam-yas temple in the late eighth century CE to determine whether Tibet would accept Indian or Chinese Buddhism as normative.<sup>2</sup> In the stories of the

<sup>1</sup> In this context, 'simultaneous' indicates that all methods are encompassed by a single method, and all stages of realisation are traversed at once. The secondary signification is a time-based distinction: immediate, sudden accomplishment versus gradual, slow, accomplishment. The Chinese words are *tun-wu* (sudden, simultaneous enlightenment) and *chien-wu* (gradual enlightenment), the respective schools of thought being *tun-men* and *chien-men*. These terms and their translation have been discussed in Stein, 1987, pp.46-51.

<sup>2</sup> On the questions regarding the historical occurrence of the debate, see Gomez 1983 and Seyfort Ruegg 1992, which also summarise previous discussions of this topic. Whether the debate occurred as a historical event or not, the

23 Cf. R.C. Childers, *Dictionary of the Pali Language*, p. 196, s.v. *kevalo*: *kevalam* = Nirvāṇa; PTSD, p. 226, s.v. *kevalin*: 'one who is fully accomplished, an Arahant'... See also E. Hardy (ed.), *The Netṭi-Pakaraṇa with Extracts from Dhammapāla's Commentary*, PTS, 1902, p. 10: *kevalan ti lokuttaram na misaṃ lokiyeḥi dhammeḥi*; M. Walleser, H. Kopp (eds.), *Manorathapūraṇi*, Vol. II, PTS, 1930, p. 376: *kevalam vusitavā uttamapuriso ti vuccatīti*.

24 Lit.: 'whose tail is broken'.

25 *Janmano* ('since birth') is left untranslated.

debate, the Indian side was identified with gradualism and the Chinese side with simultaneism, a greatly simplified version of the complexities of early Buddhist influences on Tibet which nonetheless became widely accepted in Tibet. According to tradition, the Indian Buddhist scholar Kamalaśīla, arguing for the gradualist position, opposed a Chinese monk called Hwa-shang Mahāyāna, who was arguing for the simultaneist position. In the Tibetan versions of the story, Hwa-shang was defeated and his method rejected.

For Tibetan scholars of later generations, Hwa-shang Mahāyāna came to be an emblem for a particular kind of erroneous doctrine, the belief in a simultaneous realisation caused by the mere cessation of concepts (*mi rtog pa* or *mi bsam pa*), which became a standard object of rebuttal. Later, Hwa-shang's defeat was put to polemical use against certain Tibetan practice traditions, in particular the Mahāmudrā (*phyag chen*) of the bKa'-brgyud school and the Great Perfection (*rdzogs chen*) of the rNying-ma school.<sup>3</sup> The Great Perfection's teachings on technique-free meditation were subject to accusations of being no more than the simultaneous method of Hwa-shang. rNying-ma scholars were often forced to defend the validity of the Great Perfection against this accusation in polemical texts. The following passage by mKhas-grub-rje (1385-1438) is a good example of the kind of criticism levelled against rNying-ma practitioners:

[Moreover,] many who hold themselves to be meditators of the Snow-mountains [of Tibet] talk, in exalted cryptic terms, of theory free from all affirmation, of meditative realisation free from all mentations, of [philosophical] practice free from all denial and assertion and of a fruit free from all wishes and qualms. And they imagine that understanding is born in the

constant stream when – because in a state where there is no mentation about anything at all there arises something like non-identification of anything at all – one thinks that there exists nothing that is either identical or different. By so doing one has proclaimed great nihilism where there is nothing to be affirmed according to a doctrinal system of one's own, as well as the thesis of the Hwa shang in which nothing can be the object of mentation.<sup>4</sup>

In view of this kind of criticism it is perhaps surprising that some rNying-ma writers, rather than simply defending themselves against such accusations by distancing their own teachings from those of Hwa-shang Mahāyāna, attempt a balanced judgement of the simultaneist doctrine and sometimes go so far as to express approval. Rather than repeating the standard presentations of Hwa-shang's beliefs as a misguided straying from the true path, as most were content to do, certain rNying-ma scholars continued to engage with the problem of simultaneous versus gradual approaches, and its relationship to their own Great Perfection practices.

This article is an examination of the treatment of Hwa-shang by two eighteenth-century writers. The first is Kaḥ-thog Tshe-dbang Nor-bu (1698-1755), who deals with the teachings of Hwa-shang Mahāyāna in his history of the Chinese simultaneist school. The second is 'Jigs-med Gling-pa (1730-98), in whose *Kun mkhyen zhal lung*, a discourse on the 'three liberations' of the Great Perfection, there is an annotation defending Hwa-shang. This annotation, along with an even more brief comment by Klong-chen-pa (1308-63), has been taken by some as evidence of the rNying-ma school's longstanding connection with Chan Buddhism.<sup>5</sup> In

stories of it had particular significance for later generations of Tibetans.

<sup>3</sup> One early and influential polemical statement is found in the Sa-skya Paṇḍita's (1182-1251) treatise *sDom gsum rab byed*, which criticised the teaching of the doctrine of simultaneous realisation called 'the white panacea' (*dkar po cig thub*) in Mahāmudrā and, in passing, directed a similar criticism towards rDzogs-chen as a 'Chinese tradition' (*rgya nag lugs*). There have been several discussions on this subject, of which perhaps the best are Seyfort Ruegg 1989 and Jackson 1994.

<sup>4</sup> Translation in Seyfort Ruegg 1981, p.233. The text is the *sTong thun skal bzang mig byed*, f.152, in volume *ka* of the *gSung 'bum* (Zhol edition). mKhas-grub-rje's presentation of the faulty doctrine in terms of view, meditation, activity and fruit identifies it as the Great Perfection, as these are standard definitions of the Great Perfection found in many of the texts of that system. The polemics directed against the Great Perfection are also discussed in Karmay 1988, pp.121-33, 178-84, 186-9, 195-7. See also Jackson 1994, p.53, n.118, on Rong-zom Chos-kyi bZang-po's defence of the Great Perfection.

<sup>5</sup> The passage by Klong-chen-pa is in his *sDe gsum snying pa*, a commentary on



fact, these eighteenth-century texts tell us little or nothing about the original connections between the Great Perfection and Chan, but a great deal about rNying-ma scholars' attempts to deal with the perceived connection. As will be seen, these two scholars deal with it in quite different ways, but I will suggest that they share a similar motivation, connected to the political events in central Tibet in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

## 2. *Kaḥ-thog Tshe-dbang Nor-bu*

Kaḥ-thog-dbang Nor-bu was the head of Kaḥ-thog monastery and ranks as one of the most impressive scholars of eighteenth-century Tibet. His studies took in both the texts of the rNying-ma and those of the new schools; he exchanged rNying-ma for bKa'-brgyud teachings with the Twelfth Karmapa, Byang-chub rDo-rje (1703-32),<sup>6</sup> and wrote a history of the transmission of Mahāmudrā. Tshe-dbang Nor-bu studied and championed the forbidden Jonang doctrines, writing several works on the 'empty of other' (*gzhan stong*) theory and on the *Kālacakratāntra*, the source of the 'empty of other' in the Tantric corpus. He also wrote some non-religious works on history and geography and travelled widely, making several journeys to Nepal.

In his *Sa bon tsam smos pa*,<sup>8</sup> a study of the Chinese lineage which begins with Bodhidharma and includes Hwa-shang Mahāyāna, Tshe-dbang Nor-bu makes use of a number of old sources including the then rare ninth-century treatise *bSam gtan mig sgron* by gNubs Sangs-rgyas Ye-shes. Tshe-dbang Nor-bu cites two statements from the *bSam gtan mig sgron*. The first is that it is important to write about the simultaneous path because of its similarities with the Great Perfection, which could cause a mistaken identification of the two. The second and more controversial

statement is that the path of Hwa-shang Mahāyāna is a pure path.<sup>9</sup> In the *bSam gtan mig sgron* itself, the simultaneous path is ranked above the gradualist path, but below the Vajrayāna and the Great Perfection. This is the model followed by Tshe-dbang Nor-bu, who stresses that the simultaneous path is based on the sūtras, specifically on the Sūtra of the Third Turning of the Wheel. He defends this statement against the objection that, according to all the sūtras, enlightenment is only achieved after a number of incalculable aeons, with a quotation from the Chinese translation of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*:

If one who is skilled in means applies himself diligently to this sūtra, that sage will reach perfect enlightenment, unsurpassable and totally pure, before very long.<sup>10</sup>

Having established the legitimacy of the simultaneous path, Tshe-dbang Nor-bu is keen to show that it is inferior to the Vajrayāna. He states that when the sūtras speak of Buddhahood, it is intentional, and goes on to discuss the progress towards the goal according to the Pāramitāyāna (or sūtra path) and Vajrayāna (or mantra path).

Having initially travelled the paths of accumulation and application by the sūtra path alone, at the stage of attaining the first *bhūmi* most enter the mantra path. Those who do not enter do exist, but after the eighth *bhūmi*, where one is initiated by the Teachers, they will have entered into mindfulness under their own power without relying on external conditions in the manner of the mantra path. Thus although we teach the importance of entering the mantra path rather than the sūtra path, from the level of the eighth *bhūmi* onwards one is on the path of initiation into the state of awareness where there is no opportunity to negate or purify. This is the case whichever the original entrance gate, sūtra or mantra, but because one needs to prac-

the *gNas lugs rin po che'i mdzod*, from the *mDzod bdun* collection. This passage is used to show rNying-ma and Chan affinities in Guenther 1989, pp.140-1, n.2., and Karmay 1988, p.96.

<sup>6</sup> Karma Thinley 1980, p.114.

<sup>7</sup> Smith 1969, pp.8-9.

<sup>8</sup> *rGya nag hwa shang gi byung tshul grub mtha'i phyogs snga bcas sa bon tsam smos pa*: *Collected Works*, vol.V pp.419-50.

<sup>9</sup> *Sa bon tsam smos pa*, p.434: dgos pa ni rdzogs chen dang cha 'dra bas mi nor ba'i tshad du yin par gsung ba dang | hwa shang gi chos de yang yang dag pa'i lam du bzhed pa'o ||

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.435-6: de bas na shin tu thabs mkhas pas mdo sde'di la brtson 'grus su nan tan byas na skyes bu de ni ring por mi thogs par bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub par 'gyur ro ||

tise for a shorter time with mantra, the time when one attains the fruit of perfect and totally pure Buddhahood is the distinction between sūtra and mantra. There is no difference in Buddhahood itself, so there is no harm in the indirect teachings.<sup>11</sup>

Tshe-dbang Nor-bu's position is that whether one starts on the sūtra or mantra path is irrelevant from the point of view of the goal. It is possible to progress through all ten *bhūmis* on the sūtra path, but from the eighth *bhūmi* onwards the practitioner is in effect on the mantra path. The benefit of entering the mantra path at the first *bhūmi* is that one will attain the goal more swiftly. Tshe-dbang Nor-bu apparently ignores certain characteristics of the simultaneist doctrine of Hwa-shang in order to fit it to the model of the standard Pāramitāyāna. In contrast to an orderly progression through the ten *bhūmis*, Hwa-shang is said to have spoken of direct access to the tenth *bhūmi*.<sup>12</sup> Tshe-dbang Nor-bu seems to be aware that this treatment is not altogether adequate: remarking on its brevity, he writes that there is no need to elaborate further merely for the sake of a few doubts.<sup>13</sup>

Tshe-dbang Nor-bu also touches on the contemporary situation in the following passage:

Even today in China there are Hwa-shangs of the Chan school who teach only in the *tsung men* style.<sup>14</sup> Here in Tibet too, there are a declining few who assert that one should from the

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p.437: thog mar tshogs sbyor gyi lam mdo lam 'ba' zhig pas bsgrod nas sa dang po thob pa'i skabs su sngags lam la 'jug par shas che zhing gal te tshul ston gyi dbang gi sa bgyad pa'i bar du mi 'jug pa dag yod srid kyang sa bgyud pa nas gzhan rkyen la ltos pa ma yin par sngags kyi ngang tshul rang stobs kyi shes bzhin du 'jug tu yod pa yin pas des na mdo lam du sngags la 'jug dgos zhes la bstan kyang sa bgyad pa yan chad nas ngang gi shes pa'i dbang gi lam la 'tshang pa dang chad pa'i go skans med la | gzhan yang thog ma'i 'jug sgo mdo sngags gang yin kyang rtung mthar sngags la gzhol dgos pas yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas kyi 'bras bu thob tshe mdo sngags tha dad kyi sangs rgyas bye du med pa'i phyr de ltar dgongs te gsungs pas skyon med pa'o ||

<sup>12</sup> *sBa bzhed*, p.68, and other sources. See Faber 1986, pp.47-8.

<sup>13</sup> *Sa bon tsam smos pa*, p.437.

<sup>14</sup> *tsung men* is one of the Tibetan transliterations of Chinese *tun men*.

beginning aim for the deep inner meaning, saying: 'Listen to the instructions on the mind without distinguishing discipline and wildness.' However they have no more than a partial similarity to each other.<sup>15</sup>

Tshe-dbang Nor-bu appears to be pointing to certain contemporary Great Perfection and Mahāmudrā teachers who spurn the gradual path – with the interesting aside that these types are in decline. His main point is that there is no more than a partial similarity between the Chinese and Tibetan teachers. Tshe-dbang Nor-bu's opinion is that the Chinese teachers abandon the stages of hearing and contemplating (*thos bsam*) and make meditation (*bsam gtan*) the entire path, while the Great Perfection contains all three stages. As evidence for the presence of the gradual stages in the Great Perfection he invokes the scriptural authority of the *Nyi zla kha sbyor*, one of the *Seventeen Tantras*, in which, he says, seven stages of activity are taught as well as the essential point which encompasses them.<sup>16</sup>

Finally, Tshe-dbang Nor-bu also sets down what he sees as the correct use of the terms 'simultaneist' and 'gradualist'. He argues that, while the Chinese Hwa-shangs distinguish between two types of practitioner, the simultaneist and the gradualist, there is no such distinction found in the Indian teachings which came to Tibet. In the non-Chinese context, the only correct use of the terms is to say (in Tshe-dbang Nor-bu's words):

Indian teachers of the past such as the great monk Jñānānendra who relied on the teaching of the threefold *prajñā* are the gradualists, and the followers of the Chinese sage Mahāyāna, because they apply themselves to contemplation alone, are known as simultaneists.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>15</sup> *Sa bon tsam smos pa*, p.438: da lta rgya nag tu bsam gtan mkhan hwa shang tshung men rnam tshul kho na yin 'dug la | bod 'dir yang btsun pa dang khyim pa ris summed parsems khrid nod do zhes thog ma nas zab mo nang don la gzhol bar 'dod pa phal cher 'di nyams kyang de dang cha mthun pa las gzhan du ma dmigs so ||

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p.439: des na sngon gya gar mkhan po zhi ba 'cho yi rjes su brangs ba bandhe chen po ye shes dbang po la sogs pas shes rab gsum bsgrags mar mdzad



Tshe-dbang Nor-bu believes that to use the terms *simultaneist* and *gradualist* within the context of Indo-Tibetan Buddhism is an error. Simultaneism is a Chinese phenomenon, unknown to the mainstream Indo-Tibetan tradition. Thus his position is ultimately an orthodox one although, like gNubs Sangs-rgyas Ye-shes, he does not reject the simultaneous path of Chan, rather he merely attempts to put it in its proper place.

### 3. 'Jigs-med Gling-pa

'Jigs-med Gling-pa has an important place in the rNying-ma tradition as the redactor of a very popular treasure cycle, the *Klong chen snying thig*, as the author of a comprehensive exposition of the Buddhist Path as it is known in the rNying-ma school, the *Yon tan mdzod*, and as the editor of one of the best editions of the collected tantras of the rNying-ma school. In most of his endeavours he saw himself as reviving the activities of the great fourteenth-century scholar Klong-chen-pa (1308-53). The *Klong chen snying thig* cycle contains several tantras and *sādhana*s, which are said to derive from the eighth century, as well as numerous commentaries upon these texts, the authorship of which is claimed by 'Jigs-med Gling-pa himself. In one of these commentaries, called *Kun mkhyen zhal lung*, 'Jigs-med Gling-pa attempts a response to the criticism that the Great Perfection is equivalent to the non-conceptualisation taught by Hwa-shang Mahāyāna.

'Jigs-med Gling-pa's differentiation of the two approaches is based on the distinction, particular to the Instruction Series (*man ngag sde*) of the Great Perfection, between *sems*, the Sāmsāric, conceptual mind, and *rig pa*, the Nirvāṇic, non-conceptual mind. The meditation practices of the Instruction Series found in the *Klong chen snying thig* proceed on the basis of this distinction, which comes from the earliest Instruction Series scriptures, the *Seventeen Tantras*.<sup>18</sup> Therefore it is not surprising that 'Jigs-med Gling-pa insists upon the importance of the distinction. He argues that, if the meditator attempts to stop conceptual activity without

distinguishing between *sems* and *rig pa*, the result is a blank indeterminacy (*lung ma bstan*). In *rig pa*, he argues, conceptualisation is neutralised in a state that is 'like a crystal ball', a simile which points to clarity and vividness, rather than indeterminacy and blankness.<sup>19</sup>

'Jigs-med Gling-pa's insistence on this distinction between the simultaneist doctrine and the Great Perfection makes the note he attaches to this passage quite surprising. Stepping outside of the standard model of accusation and rebuttal, he goes on to defend Hwa-shang:

You have made the assertion that the view of Ha-shang<sup>20</sup> was like this, based on refutations such as the similarity of non-mentation to an egg.<sup>21</sup> Yet scriptures such as the *Buddhāva-tamsaka* were known to Ha-shang. During the debate, Kamalaśīla asked what was the cause of Saṃsāra by the symbolic action of whirling his staff around his head. [Ha-shang] answered that it was the apprehender and the apprehended by the symbolic action of shaking out his robes twice.<sup>22</sup> It is undeniable that such a teacher was of the sharpest faculties. If non-recollection and non-mentation entail the offence of rejecting the wisdom of differentiating analysis, then the Prajñāpāramitā sūtras of the Conqueror also entail this fault. Therefore, what the view of Ha-shang actually was can be known by a perfect Buddha, and no one else.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>19</sup> *Kun mkhyen zhal lung*, pp.527-8

<sup>20</sup> 'Jigs-med Gling-pa and Klong-chen-pa prefer the spelling Ha-shang, at least in the editions available to me.

<sup>21</sup> This appears to be a reference to the summary of the refutations of Hwa-shang's position in the *sBa bzhed* (pp.71-2) where it is spoken by Ye-shes dBang-po.

<sup>22</sup> This is a reference to the account of the first meeting of the two opponents before the debate had taken place. It is found in the *rGyal rabs gsal ba'i me long* (see Sørensen 1994, p.401, and Tucci 1978, p.365), where the text has Hwa-shang casting his robe to the ground (*sa la brdabs*) rather than shaking it (*sprugs*). The story is also found in the *sBa bzhed* (pp.66-7), to which 'Jigs-med Gling-pa's account has a greater similarity.

<sup>23</sup> *Kun mkhyen zhal lung*, pp.527-8: khyed cag gi 'dod pa ha shang la lta ba nor 'di lta bu zhig yod de snyam pa ci yang mi sems pa sgo nga lta bu'i phyogs snga ji

pa la brten rim gyis pa dang rgya nag mkhan po ma ha yā na'i rjes brang mams kyi bsam gtan na la gzhöl bas cig char bar grags pa shes pa bya'o ||

<sup>18</sup> *rNying ma'i rgyud bcu bdun*.

In his defence of Hwa-shang, 'Jigs-med Gling-pa had a precedent in the works of Klong-chen-pa. In one section of his *sDe gsum snying po*, Klong-chen-pa writes on the subject of the transcendence of the consequences of positive and negative actions in the context of Great Perfection practice. There is a famous statement attributed to Hwa-shang Mahāyāna on this same subject, that virtue and vice are like black and white clouds, in that both cover up the sun. Rather than distancing himself from this, Klong-chen-pa uses the same metaphor, and then goes on to say:

When the great master Ha-shang said this, those of lesser intellects could not comprehend it, but he was in accordance with the [ultimate] truth.<sup>24</sup>

'Jigs-med Gling-pa held Klong-chen-pa in great reverence and was certainly familiar with the *sDe gsum snying po*. Klong-chen-pa himself was also following a precedent, set by the twelfth-century rNying-ma-pa Nyang-ral Nyi-ma 'Od-zer (1124-92), in his *Chos 'byung me tog snying po*. Nyi-ma 'Od-zer states that there is no difference in [ultimate] truth (*don*) between the two paths, but that for those of the highest faculties (*dbang po*, Skt. *indriya*), there is the simultaneous method of Hwa-shang, and for those of medium and below there is the graduated path.<sup>25</sup>

It is interesting to note that, in categorising Hwa-shang as a

bzhin 'dir bkod nas brjod kyi gzhan du na sangs rgyas phal po che la sogs pa'i gsung rab mang po ha shang gi blo la bzhugs shing | kāma la shi las sgra rtsod dris pa'i tshe phyags shing klad la bskor ba'i brdaś 'khor ba'i rgyu dris pa ua | ber gyi thu ba gnyis sprugs nas gzung 'dzin gyis lan bya ba'i brda lan ston nus pa sogs dbang po shin tu rmon po'i gang zag yin par bsnyon du med la | gang dran pa med cing yid la byar med pa la so sor rtog pa'i shes rab spangs pa'i nyes pa 'jug na skyon 'di rgyal ba'i yum la'ang 'jug pas don dam par ha shang gi lta ba yin min rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas kho nas mkhyen gyis gzhan gyis ma yin no |

<sup>24</sup> *sDe gsum snying po*, p.97: | slob dpon chen po ha shang gis gsungs pas de dus blo dman pa'i blor ma shong yang don la de bzhin du gnas so |

<sup>25</sup> Meisezahl 1985, p.294, f.435b: de nas btsan po'i zhal nas don la mi thun pa tsam mi 'dug ste lam spyongs lugs la ha shang gi chos cig char du 'jug mchis pa'o | dbang po yang rab sbyangs pa can gyis chos yin la | dbang po 'bring yan chad chos spyod bcu la skyon bska |

particularly astute practitioner of a bygone era, Klong-chen-pa and 'Jigs-me Gling-pa are treating him in the same way as they treat the early Indian masters of the Vajrayāna lineages of the rNying-ma school. An example of the way these early Indian masters are categorised is found in another of 'Jigs-med Gling-pa's explanatory texts from the *Klong chen snying thig*:

Those trainees of the very sharpest faculties like dGa'-rab rDo-rje, Self-arisen Padmasambhava and Indrabhūti, who were lords of the *maṇḍala* while seeming to be ordinary students, were spontaneously liberated upon hearing, but gradualist people will not reach the goal in that way. So in this situation there is some further striving for complete liberation.<sup>26</sup>

In this, once again, 'Jigs-med Gling-pa is following Klong-chen-pa's lead, as the following passage by the latter shows:

The great *yogis* who arrived at that state [of enlightenment], like Padmasambhava, Vimalamitra and Telopa, taught directly, without cause and effect, virtue or vice. Even if we understand this intellectually, we have not reached it through becoming truly accustomed to it, so we are taught it after we have distinguished the subtle aspects of cause and effect and are no longer afraid of that state.<sup>27</sup>

'Jigs-med Gling-pa uses the distinctions between the faculties of trainees in his *Klong chen snying thig* texts as a way of placing the simultaneous aspects of the Great Perfection beyond the reach of contemporary practitioners. The simultaneous actualisation of the Great Perfection is stated to be possible only for those of the sharpest faculties, and 'Jigs-med Gling-pa makes it clear that in his

<sup>26</sup> *Padma dkar po*, p.478: de yang dbang po rnon mchog gi gdul bya dga' rab rdo rje dang | rang byung padma indra bhū ti sogs pa ni dkyil 'khor gyi bdag po nyid thun mong gdul bya'i snang ngor lam la 'jug pa'i tshul bstan pa tsam yin phyir skabs 'dir yang grol ba don du gnyer ba zhig yin phyin chad ||

<sup>27</sup> This passage is cited in 'Jigs-med Gling-pa's *Ye shes bla ma*, p.332: gshis der phebs pa'i rnal 'byor pa chen po rnam la rgyu 'bras dge sdig med pa thod drang du bshad de padma dang | ma la dang | te lo pa la sogs pa bzhin no | rang cag mams la blos de ltar rtogs kyang goms pas thog du ma 'phebs pas | gshis la mi skrag cing || I have not been able to locate the passage in Klong-chen-pa's works.



view such types are rare nowadays, if any exist at all. This qualification would also put the simultaneist path of Hwa-shang, described by 'Jigs-med Gling-pa as being for those of the sharpest faculties only, in a purely theoretical role.

Thus Klong-chen-pa and 'Jigs-med Gling-pa seem to have been tempted to place Hwa-shang, as an individual, in the same category as the great masters of the Indian lineage who are said to have achieved enlightenment in an immediate fashion. However, the simultaneist approach of Hwa-shang is, by this same move, placed outside the realm of possibility for ordinary practitioners. In this, as we have seen, 'Jigs-med Gling-pa is restating themes from Klong-chen-pa's works. Perhaps the former's original contribution in the *Kun mkhyen zhal lung* is his contention that there is a scriptural basis for the simultaneist path as much as for the gradual path in the Prajñāpāramitā sūtras, an insight which appears to be based on comparative readings of texts, rather than the standardised rubrics of Tibetan scholarship.

#### 4. Comparisons

'Jigs-med Gling-pa and Tshe-dbang Nor-bu represent two different approaches to the simultaneist teachings of Hwa-shang Mahāyāna. The first approach, represented by Klong-chen-pa and 'Jigs-med Gling-pa, treats Hwa-shang Mahāyāna more as an individual than as the representative of a school, and suggests that his realisation might be equal to the realisation of the Great Perfection practitioner.<sup>28</sup> They imply that the simultaneous method followed by Hwa-shang is similar to the approach of the early Great Perfection and Mahāmudrā masters such as Vimalamitra and Telopa. However, this method is said to be beyond the reach of most, if not all, contemporary practitioners.

The second approach, that of gNubs Sangs-rgyas Ye-shes and Tshe-dbang Nor-bu, is to deal with Hwa-shang Mahāyāna as the representative of a Chinese school of Buddhism which he calls simultaneism (*cig char 'jug pa*), *tsen min*, or the teaching of the Chan masters (*bsam gtan gyi mkhan po*). This school is accepted

<sup>28</sup> The equivalence between the realisation of Chinese simultaneists and the Great Perfection meditators is also asserted in the *Blon po bka' thang*, the *gter ma* of O-rgyan Gling-pa (1329-67), which has been translated in Tucci 1978.

to represent a valid method, which is placed in a hierarchy where it has a status higher than the gradual path but lower than the higher Tantras of the Vajrayāna and the Great Perfection.

'Jigs-med Gling-pa's approach is based on what might be called a yogic point of view, wherein the individual paths are seen from the perspective of the goal, ultimate truth, and there is an emphasis on the individual realisation of the exponents of these paths rather than the categorisation of their doctrines. Tshe-dbang Nor-bu's approach is primarily doxographic, and the aim is the classic scholarly Tibetan one of ranking different paths into an exclusive hierarchy. The Great Perfection, and other Tibetan teachings, are protected from contamination by more questionable doctrines.

Neither 'Jigs-med Gling-pa nor Tshe-dbang Nor-bu make any attempt to identify Great Perfection with the simultaneous path. In fact both writers are careful to distance the approach of the Great Perfection of their time from the eighth-century simultaneism of Hwa-shang Mahāyāna, and Tshe-dbang Nor-bu also takes care to make the distinction between the Great Perfection and the Chinese Chan teachings of his own time. For Tshe-dbang Nor-bu, the Great Perfection is inherently a gradual path, and simultaneism is restricted to the Chinese Chan schools. For 'Jigs-med Gling-pa, the Great Perfection can be a simultaneous path, but only for those of the very sharpest faculties, and he makes it clear that few if any contemporary practitioners fall into this category; thus his position is actually very close to that of Tshe-dbang Nor-bu.

There remains the question of why these two eighteenth-century rNying-ma writers, both aware of the criticisms of the Great Perfection from other schools which had occurred through the preceding centuries, should open themselves to further criticism by discussing the doctrines of Hwa-shang in any sort of positive light at all. Both 'Jigs-med Gling-pa and Tshe-dbang Nor-bu were writing within a tradition of openness towards these doctrines, supported by the writings of past scholars from their school. While Tshe-dbang Nor-bu's interest in early sources brought him to the *bsam gtan mig sgron*, 'Jigs-med Gling-pa's general enthusiasm for what was unique in the doctrines of the rNying-ma brought him to the comments on Hwa-shang Mahāyāna by Klong-chen-pa. Thus both were maintaining what they

saw as the particular approach of the rNying-ma tradition to this matter.

Such a motivation maybe seen as arising from the developments in the seventeenth century, when the monastic presence of the rNying-ma school dramatically increased in Tibet, and certain influential figures such as gTer-bdag gLing-pa (1646-1714) and Lo-chen Dharmaśrī (1654-1717) gathered together and standardised the corpus of rNying-ma texts. On the other hand, the rNying-ma was also subject to considerable persecution at the hands of the Dzungar invaders, who sacked several of the monasteries in Tibet and killed many of the lamas, including Lo-chen Dharmaśrī.<sup>29</sup> Some kind of persecution continued through to the lifetimes of 'Jigs-med Gling-pa and Kah-thog Tshe-dbang Nor-bu; the latter composed a letter written to the Seventh Dalai Lama, dated at around 1750, which makes a plea for an end to the persecution of the rNying-ma.<sup>30</sup> The combination of an increasing confidence and self-consciousness within the rNying-ma school, and intermittent persecutions, suggest a climate in which rNying-ma writers might well be concerned to present and support the unique and unusual aspects of their own school.

Sam van Schaik  
(The International Dunhuang  
Project, The British Library)

## Bibliography:

- Demiéville, P., 1952: *Le Concile de Lhasa*, Paris.  
Faber, F., 1985: 'A Tibetan Dunhuang Treatise on Simultaneous Enlightenment: The *dMyigs su myed pa tshul gcig pa'i gzhung*', *Acta Orientalia* 46, pp.47-77.  
— 1986: 'The Council of Tibet According to the *sBa bzhed*', *ibid.* 47, pp.33-61.  
Gomez, L O., 1983: 'Indian Materials on the Doctrine of Sudden Enlightenment', in Lai, Whalen & Lancaster, Lewis (eds), *Early Ch'an in China and Tibet*, Berkeley, pp.393-434.

<sup>29</sup> See Petech 1950 for an account of this period.

<sup>30</sup> Kah-thog Tshe-dbang Nor-bu, *Selected Writings*, pp.743-58.

- Guenther, H V., 1989: *Tibetan Buddhism in a Western Perspective*, Emeryville.  
Houston, G., 1974: 'The bSam yas Debate: According to the rGyal rabs gsal ba'i me long', *Central Asiatic Journal* 18, pp.209-16.  
Karma Thinley Rinpoche, 1980: *The History of the Sixteen Karmapas of Tibet*, Boulder, CO.  
Karmay, S G., 1988: *The Great Perfection (rDzogs Chen)*, Leiden.  
Jackson, D P., 1994: *Enlightenment by Single Means*, Vienna.  
Meizezahl, R O., 1985: *Die Große Geschichte des tibetischen Buddhismus nach dem alter Tradition rNiñ ma'i chos 'byuñ chen mo*, Sankt Augustin.  
Petech, Luciano, 1950: *China and Tibet in the Early Eighteenth Century*, Leiden.  
Seyfort Ruegg, D., 1989: *Buddha-nature, Mind and the problem of Gradualism*, London  
— 1992: 'On the Historiography and Doxography of the "Great Debate of bSam yas"', in Ihara, Shoren (ed.) *Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the 5th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies (Narita 1989)*, Tokyo.  
Smith, EG., 1969: Preface. In *The Autobiographical Reminiscences of Ngag-dDang dPal-bzang, Late Abbot of Kah-Thog Monastery*, ed. Sonam T Kazi, Gangtok.  
Sørensen, Per K., 1994: *Tibetan Buddhist historiography: The mirror illuminating the royal genealogies: an annotated translation of the XIVth century Tibetan chronicle: rGyal rabs gsal-ba'i me-long*, Wiesbaden.  
Stein, R A., 1987: 'Sudden Illumination or Simultaneous Comprehension', in Gregory, Peter N (ed.), *Sudden and Gradual: Approaches to Enlightenment in Chinese Thought*, Honolulu, pp.41-66. [This is a translation by Neal Donner of 'Illumination subite ou saisie simultanée, note sur la terminologie chinoise et tibétaine', *Annales du Musée Guimet* CLXXX (1971), pp.3-30.]  
Tucci, G., 1978: *Minor Buddhist Texts (Parts I and II)*, Tokyo.  
Wangdu, Pasang and Diemberger, Hildegard (trans), 2000: *dBa' bzhed: The Royal Narrative Concerning the Bringing of the Buddha's Doctrine to Tibet*, Vienna.



Tibetan Texts:

Kaḥ-thog Tshe-dbang Nor-bu: *The Collected Works (gSun 'bum) of Kaḥ-thog Rig-'dzin Chen-po Tshe dBañ-nor-bu*, 6 vols, Dalhousie 1977.

*rGya nag hwa shang gi byung tshul grub mtha'i phyogs snga bcas sa bon tsam smos pa* (vol.V, pp.419-50)

*Selected Writings of Kaḥ-thog Rig-'dzin Tshe-dban-nor-bu*, Darjeeling 1973.

Klong-chen Rab-'byams-pa Dri-med 'Od-zer: *mDzod bdun*, 7 vols, ed. by the Yeshe De Project, India 1992.

*sDe gsum snying po don 'grel gnas lugs rin po che'i mdzod* (vol.VII, pp.51-347).

'Jigs-med Gling-pa: *Klong chen snying tig*, 3 vols, ed. Ngawang Sopa. New Delhi 1973.

*rDo rje'i tshig rkang gi don 'grel kun mkhyen zhal lung* (vol.III (*hum*), pp.520-46).

*rDo rje theg pa smin grol lam gyi rim pa las 'phros pa'i man ngag gi rgyab brten padma dkar po* (vol.III (*hum*), pp.463-516).

*rDzogs pa chen po kong chen snying tig gi gdod ma'i mgon po'i lam gyi rim pa'i khrid yig ye shes bla ma* (vol.III (*hum*), pp.293-463).

gNubs Sangs-rgyas Ye-shes: *rNal 'byor mig gi bsam or bSam gtan mig sgron*, ed. 'Khor-gdon gTer-sprul Chi-med-rig-'dzin, Leh 1974.

Nyang-ral Nyi-ma 'Od-zer: *Chos 'byung me tog snying pa*, facsimile in Meizezahl 1985.

Author Unknown:

*Rnying ma'i rgyud bcu bdun*, A 'dzom chos sgar redaction, 3 vols, ed. Sanje Dorje, New Delhi 1973-7.

*sBa bzhed*, ed. mGon po rgyal mtsham, Beijing 1982. [trans.: see above under Wangdu]

Translated from the Chinese Version by  
Thích Huyền-Vi and Bhikkhu Pāsādika  
in collaboration with Sara Boin-Webb

Twelfth Fascicle

Part 21

(The Triple Gem)

6. <sup>1</sup> 'Thus have I heard. At one time the Buddha was staying in Śrāvastī, at Jetṭ's Grove, in Anāthapiṇḍada's Park. Then the Exalted One said to the bhikṣus: If a bhikṣu is possessed of three qualities (*dharma*), he will well experience happiness in this life (*drṣṭe dharma*) and realise, through great perseverance and energy, the end of the existential constituents under the sway of the malign influences (*sāsravadharma*)<sup>2</sup>. Which are the three? There is a bhikṣu who a) is composed (*samāhita*) with respect to the sense faculties (*indriya*)<sup>3</sup>, b) moderate in eating<sup>4</sup> and c) who does not neglect his walking-exercises (*caṅkrama*)<sup>5</sup>.

How is a bhikṣu composed with respect to the sense faculties? In this regard, when seeing a form with the eye, he neither starts indulging in notions (*saṃjñā*) [concerning that form] nor does he recall [any notions]<sup>6</sup>. [Thus, by seeing with perfect mindfulness,] he

1 See T2, 603c18 ff.; Hayashi, p. 196 ff.

2 Cf. BSR 19, 2 (2002), p. 184, where this technical term also occurs against the usual non-technical *āsravakṣaya* at T2, 582b28 / BSR 10, 2 (1993), p. 220 and *passim*.

3 Rendering *indriyeṣu guptadvāratā* peculiar to EĀ (cf. SWTF fasc. 5, p. 330b; fasc. 11, p. 182a).

4 As for *bhojane mātṛajñatā* with references, see SWTF fasc. 11, *ibid.*; for *mātṛajñatā* (s.v. *guptadvāratā*) read *mātṛajñatā* (not indicated in the review at BSR 19, 1 (2002), p. 64 ff.).

5 Rather a free rendering of *jāgaryam / °yām(?) anuyukta* ('given to wakefulness'); see BHSD, p. 240a; SWTF fasc. 12, p. 291b.

6 As for 識念, *anu - √smṛ*, see Karashima, pp. 405, 595 f. For Pāli parallels to this rather deviating *āgama* version or quite free Chinese rendering of EĀ see CPD I, p. 220, s.v. *anu-vyañjana-ggāhi(n)*, e.g. D I, p. 70: *bhikkhu cakkhunā rūpaṃ disvā na nimittaggāhī hoti nānuvyañjanaggāhī*. What in EĀ are notions presenting themselves and not to be indulged in and past notions that should not be recalled, is very concretely explained in Buddhaghosa. See Bhadanta Revata-

realises purification (*viśuddhi*) regarding the faculty of the eye. By means [of this achievement] he aspires to [ultimate] freedom (*vimukti*), always guarding the faculty of the eye. When hearing a sound with the ear, smelling a scent with the nose, recognising a flavour with the tongue, feeling tangibles<sup>7</sup> with the body or being aware of mental objects with his mind, he neither starts indulging in notions nor does he recall [any notions]. [Thus, by... being aware with perfect mindfulness,] he realises purification regarding the faculty of... the mind, and by means [of this achievement] he aspires to [ultimate] freedom, always guarding the faculty of... the mind. Thus a bhikṣu is composed with regard to the sense faculties.

How is a bhikṣu moderate in eating? In this regard [he takes his food,] thinking where it has come from, and not in order to become plump (*sthūla*) and beautiful (*gaura*). [He eats] only<sup>8</sup> with a view to supporting (T2, 604a) the body and keeping the four phy-

dhama (ed.), *Visuddhimaggo*, Vol. I, with *Paramatthamaññāsāṅkā*, Varanasi 1969, p. 65 f.: *itthipurisanimittam vā subhanimittādikaṃ vā kilesavattubhūtaṃ nimittam na gaṇhāti, ditthamatte yeva saññhāti nānuyāñjanaggāhīti ... hatthapādasitahasitakathita... bhedam ākāram na gaṇhāti...* Bhikkhu Nāṇamoli, *The Path of Purification*, Colombo 1956, p. 21: '... he does not apprehend the sign of woman or man, or any sign that is a basis for defilement such as the sign of beauty, etc.: he stops at what is merely seen. Nor the particulars: he does not apprehend any aspect classed as hand, foot, smile, laughter, talk...'

In connection with *saññā* in EĀ cf. n. 232 on the important passage at M I, p. 111 f. (Madhupindikasutta) in Bh. Nāṇamoli, Bh. Bodhi, *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha*, Boston 1995, 2001, p. 1205: "This passage shows how *papañca*, emerging from the process of cognition, gives rise to perceptions and notions that overwhelm and victimise their hapless creator... What is perceived as 'this' is thought about in its differences and is thus diversified from 'that' and from 'me'. This diversification – involving craving for form, wrong view about permanence of form, etc., and the conceit 'I am' – leads to preoccupation with calculating the desirability of past and present forms with a view to obtaining desirable forms in the future."

As for 'notions and recalled notions' in EĀ, see Alex Wayman, 'Regarding the Translation of the Buddhist Terms *saññā* / *sañjñā*, *viññāṇa* / *vijñāna*', in: O.H. de A. Wijesekera (ed.), *Malalasekera Commemoration Volume*, Colombo 1976, pp. 324-35, for critical appraisal. Interestingly, in the given context Wayman quotes David Hume: 'All ideas are borrowed from preceding perceptions. Our ideas are borrowed from preceding perceptions. Our ideas of objects, therefore, are derived from that source' (*loc. cit.*, p. 327).

<sup>7</sup> I.e. *spraṣṭavya*; cf. Karashima, p. 483: 細滑... *sparśa*.

<sup>8</sup> For this special meaning of 趣 see Karashima, p. 338.

sical elements (*caturmahābhūta*)<sup>9</sup> in shape (*sakala*), [reflecting:] Now I should check former pangs [of hunger] and prevent new ones from arising, letting the body have [enough] strength to practise the [Noble] Path and lest the holy life (*brahmacarya*) be impeded. – [Take] for example a bad abscess that has developed on a man's or woman's body. Someone applies a salve to that abscess, and this [salve] is applied for the [sole] purpose of occasioning a cure. Similarly, O bhikṣus, a bhikṣu is moderate in eating, thinking where the food [that he is taking] has come from; he does not [take it] in order to become stout... and [he eats] only with a view to supporting the body... lest the holy life be impeded. – [Take again] for example a cart [carrying] heavy loads. Its wheels are greased for the [sole] purpose of delivering heavy [loads] at their destinations. Similarly, a bhikṣu is moderate in eating, thinking... he does not [take food] in order to become stout... Thus a bhikṣu is moderate in eating.

How does a bhikṣu not neglect his walking-exercises? In this regard, in the first and last [watches of] the night he diligently and mindfully takes his walking-exercises without being mistaken about the periods [of day and night]. Continually he directs his attention to making use of<sup>10</sup> the aids to enlightenment (*bodhipakṣa*)<sup>11</sup>. During daytime, whether he is walking or sitting, he wisely reflects on the eminent Teaching (*prañitadharma*) [and thus] rids himself of the hindrances (*nīvaraṇa*) diminishing [all his efforts]<sup>12</sup>. Again, in the first [watch of] the night, whether he is walking or sitting, he wisely reflects... and rids himself...; in the middle [watch of] the night, lying on his right side<sup>13</sup>, he directs his attention to waking up<sup>14</sup> [again]; in the last [watch of] the night he rises [and starts] walking; he wisely reflects on the profound Teaching, ridding himself of the hindrances

<sup>9</sup> See Nyanatiloka, pp. 44 (s.v. *dhātu*), 87 (s.v. *mahā-bhūta*).

<sup>10</sup> Lit.: 'mindfully he keeps his mind staying in'.

<sup>11</sup> See BHSD, p. 402b; Nyanatiloka, p. 31 (s.v. *bodhipakkhiya-dhamma*).

<sup>12</sup> Lit.: 'overshadowing hindrances'; cf. Karashima, p. 546: 陰蓋, 'covering; covering for the sake of concealment'? As for *nīvaraṇa*, *nīvaraṇa*, see BHSD, p. 311a.

<sup>13</sup> 脅 = 'rib'; here the character renders *pārśva*, 'region of the ribs, side'; cf. Mahāvvyut. 4006 (77).

<sup>14</sup> Lit.: 'bright, clear; to understand'.



diminishing [his efforts]. Thus a bhikṣu does not neglect his walking-exercises.

If a bhikṣu is composed with respect to the sense faculties, moderate in eating and if he does not neglect his walking-exercises, always mindful and directing his attention to making use of the aids to enlightenment, he will surely reap two results: in this life he will realise the [state of] a non-returner (*anāgāmin*)<sup>15</sup>. Just as a skilled charioteer drives his chariot [pulled] by four horses, keeping to the smooth surface of the middle of the road, and [thus] definitely [proceeds] without delay wherever he wishes to go, – even so this bhikṣu will definitely [reap excellent results]. If he is composed... making use of the aids to enlightenment, he will surely reap two results: in this life he will be rid of the malign influences (*kṣīṇāsra-va*) and become a non-returner. – After listening to the Buddha's words, the bhikṣus were pleased and respectfully applied themselves to practice.<sup>16</sup>

7. 'Thus have I heard. At one time... in Śrāvastī... Then the Exalted One said to the bhikṣus: There are three [kinds of] severe affliction. Which are the three? There are the severe afflictions [caused by] a) the windy humour of the body (*vāta*), b) the phlegmatic humour (*śleṣman*) and c) cold (*śīta*). These are, O bhikṣus, the three [kinds of] severe affliction. But there also are available three [kinds of] effective medicine for the three severe afflictions. Which are the three? When somebody is affected with the windy humour of the body, an effective medicine will be a) ghee (*ghṛta*); what one does in this case is to take ghee. When somebody is afflicted with the phlegmatic humour, an effective medicine will be b) honey (*madhu*); what one does... , and when somebody is afflicted with cold, an effective medicine will be c) sesame oil (*taila*); what one does in this case is to

15 Inconsistently here the text does not make it clear which is the second result. In the above first para. of this sūtra, however, it says that a) happiness will be experienced in this life and b) the malign influences be brought to an end. Cf. also below the second but last sentence of this EĀ discourse.

16 Cf. A I, p. 113 f.: *Tiṇi bhikkhave dhammehi samannāgato bhikkhu apanṇa-kataṃ paṭipadam paṭipanno hoti yoni c' assa āradhā hoti āsavānaṃ khayā-ya...*; F.L. Woodward, *Gradual Sayings* I, PTS, 1932, p. 97 ff.: 'Monks, possessed of three qualities a monk is proficient in the practice leading to the Sure Course, and he has strong grounds for the destruction of the āsavas...'

take<sup>17</sup> sesame oil. These are, bhikṣus, the three [kinds of] severe affliction and their respective cure.

Similarly, bhikṣus, there are the following three [kinds of] severe affliction. Which are the three? a) Covetousness (*lobha*) / attachment (*anunaya*), b) hatred (*dveṣa*) / aversion (*pratigha*) and c) ignorance (*avidyā*) / delusion (*moha*) – these, bhikṣus, are the three [kinds of] severe affliction. But there also are available three [kinds of] effective medicine for the three severe afflictions. Which are the three? When there are covetousness and attachment, one [should] have recourse to a) repulsiveness (*aśubha*) as remedy (*pratikāra*) by way of reflecting on what is repulsive. [When] one is afflicted with hatred and aversion, one [should] have recourse to b) friendliness (*maitrī*)<sup>18</sup> as remedy by way of cultivating friendliness in one's heart. [When] one is afflicted with ignorance and delusion, one [should] have recourse to c) wisdom (*prajñā*) as remedy by way of [insight into] dependent origination (*pratītyasamutpāda*). These are, bhikṣus, the three [kinds of] severe affliction and their respective cure. Accordingly, bhikṣus, you should aspire to skill in means to avail yourselves of<sup>19</sup> the three [kinds of] remedy. Thus, bhikṣus, you should train. – After listening to the Buddha's words, the bhikṣus were pleased... to practice.'

8. 'Thus have I heard. At one time... in Śrāvastī... Then the Exalted One said to the bhikṣus: There are three bad practises. Which are the three? Bad practice of body, speech and mind. These, O bhikṣus, are the three bad practices. One should aspire to skill in means to cultivate three good practices. Which are the three? Somebody whose practice of body, speech and mind is bad, should cultivate good practice of body, speech and mind. – Then the Exalted One uttered the following verses:

One should guard against bad practice of body and  
Cultivate good practice of body; it [should always] be

17 'To take', according to the Chinese, in the sense of 'to drink'. As regards actual practice, however, one would expect that sesame oil is 'applied', for the third 'severe affliction' is 'cold' (冷), i.e. low temperature – it is not 涼, 'the common cold' that one catches.

18 Cf. Karashima, p. 56, s.v. 慈心,

19 Lit.: 'to link up with'.

Kept in mind to give up bad practice of body, and good  
Practice of body should be learnt. One should guard  
Against bad practice of speech... and mind and  
Cultivate good practice of speech... and mind; it  
[Should always] be kept in mind to give up bad practice  
Of speech... and mind, and good practice of speech...  
And mind should be learnt.<sup>20</sup>  
[Good] practice of body is excellent, and  
[Good] practice of speech likewise, to be sure.  
[Good] practice of mind is excellent, and the same  
Holds true of [good practice] in every respect. –  
Restraint in speech, purity of mind and no bad practice  
Of body – by realising<sup>21</sup> purity in these three practices  
One will reach the [Great] Sage's<sup>22</sup> state of the  
Unconditioned (*asaṃskṛtasthāna*).

Thus, bhikṣus, one should give up the three bad practices and cultivate the three good practices, and thus, O bhikṣus, you should train. – After listening to the Buddha's words, the bhikṣus were pleased... to practice.'

20 As a parallel to this EĀ sūtra T2, 604, n. 11, Akanuma, Hayashi and Lancaster give It 64-5 [?]. Thematically there is some agreement between EĀ and It 54-5, i.e. It, chapter 3, suttas 15 and 16: *vuttam hetam bhagavatā, vuttam arahatā ti me sutam – tiṇimāni, bhikkhave, duccharitāni | katamāni tiṇi ? kāya-duccaritam, vacīduccaritam, manoduccaritam... tiṇimāni, bhikkhave, sucari-tāni...* F.L. Woodward, *The Minor Anthologies of the Pali Canon*, Part II, *Udāna: Verses of Uplift and Itivuttaka: As it was Said*, PTS, 1935, p. 157: "This was said by the Exalted One... 'Monks, there are these three evil practices. What three? Evil practice of body, speech and mind... Monks, there are these three good practices...'".

Of the following four lines of the EĀ verses (Chinese text) the first two have parallels in the Udānavarga (quoted in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, ed. P. Pradhan, Patna 1975, p. 208, 21-2), Dhṛp etc. The first to mention the EĀ verses in question as being a parallel to the Udānavarga and Dhṛp was Kōtatsu Fujita in *Kusharon shoin no Agongyō ichiran*, Sapporo 1984, p. 15. See Bh. Pāsādika, *Kanonische Zitate im Abhidharmakośabhāṣya des Vasubandhu*, Göttingen 1989, p. 77 [284] (with full references):

*kāyena saṃvaraḥ sādhu sādhu vācātha saṃvaraḥ |  
manasā saṃvaraḥ sādhu sādhu sarvatra saṃvaraḥ ||*

21 See Hackmann, p. 60, s.v. 跡... *pratipatti*.

22 *Ibid.*, p. 239 f., s.v. 仙, on Taoist terms and their Buddhist adaptation; Soothill, p. 166a.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*The Discipline in Four Parts. Rules for Nuns according to the Dharmaguptakavinaya*. Ann Heirman. 3 Parts. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 2002. XIV, 1211 pp. Rs 1,595. ISBN 81-208-1800-8.

The purpose of the present publication is 'on the one hand, to give an annotated English translation of the Chinese version of the Bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga (i.e. discipline for nuns) of the Dharmaguptakavinaya (Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō, vol.22, no.1428, pp.714-778), and on the other hand, to study the life and the career of a Buddhist nun as described in the Vinaya literature' (p.IX).

The publication is divided into three parts: part I (pp.XIV, 1-239), the 'Introduction', informs us about the Dharmaguptaka tradition (pp.11-61), discusses the career of a bhikṣuṇī (pp.63-116) including her ordination as a novice, the probationary period as a student (*śikṣamānā*) and the ordination as a nun. Then follows a survey of the seven groups of offences, which constitute the Prātimokṣa of the Bhikṣuṇīs, the determination and punishment of an offence (pp.117-211) and, finally, three important ceremonies for the monastic life, viz. the *poṣadha*, *pravāraṇā* and *kathina* ceremony (pp.213-39). Part II comprises a translation of the Bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga of the Dharmaguptakas (pp.243-983). Part III contains several indices: (1) Index of technical terms: Buddhist Sanskrit – Chinese (pp.987-1048); (2) Glossary of technical terms: Chinese – Buddhist Sanskrit (pp.1049-67); (3) Glossary of technical terms: English – Chinese – Buddhist Sanskrit (pp.1069-83); (4) Index of Proper Names: Buddhist Sanskrit – Chinese (pp.1085-91); (5) Glossary of proper names: Chinese – Buddhist Sanskrit (pp.1093-5), and (6) Concordance of the Precepts for Bhikṣus and Bhikṣuṇīs of the Dharmaguptakavinaya (pp.1097-1109). The volume is concluded by a 'List of Abbreviations and Symbols' (pp. 1111-16), a Bibliography (pp.1117-44), and, finally, the Chinese text of the Bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga of the Dharmaguptakas (pp.1145-1211).

During the last few years, research in the field of Buddhist monastic discipline for nuns has increased. After the translation of the Bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣa of the Mahāsaṃghika-Lokottaravādins by Edith Nolot (*Règles de Discipline des Nonnes Bouddhistes*, Paris 1991), a study of the rules for Theravāda nuns was produced by Ute Hüsken (*Die Vorschriften für die buddhistische Nonnen-*



*gemeinde im Vinaya-Pitaka der Theravādin*, Berlin 1997) and a study of some specific rules for nuns in the Theravāda tradition compared with those of other Buddhist schools by Juo-Hsüeh Shih (*Controversies over Buddhist Nuns*, Oxford 2000). These studies reveal that, despite all conformities, there are many differences in detail between the various schools. It is, therefore, highly welcome that with the present publication the Bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga of the Dharmaguptaka school is made accessible in an English translation to the non-Chinese-reading public. In addition to this translation, Heirman presents 'a study of the content of this text within the Vinaya literature' (p.3).

The translation is provided with a quantity of often lengthy footnotes in which Heirman explains basic terms and principles of Buddhist law and frequently gives parallels from the Vinayas of other schools. In that way she seeks to give the work an 'encyclopaedic character' and organises the book 'so that it may be used as a reference book' (p.X). Without any forfeiture of information the footnotes could have been shortened if (1) – at least in the case of easily accessible sources (e.g. the Pāli Vinaya, Samantapāsādikā, etc.) – the reference were confined to the respective published text and translation (Heirman does not give own translations of these sources), if (2) the abbreviations of the Critical Pāli Dictionary, in the case of Vin and Sp given in Heirman's 'List of Abbreviations and Symbols' had been used (viz. 'Vin' for 'Pāli *vinaya*, Oldenberg, H., Vin', p.642, n.66; etc.), and if (3) superfluous statements such as '√*kram* (intensive, *caṅkram*), to walk up and down;...' had been omitted. As a whole, the translation shows that, notwithstanding all similarities, the Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya of the Dharmaguptakas is more elaborate than that of the Theravādins, viz. in Sgh 3 N the speed with which a nun moves in relation to the accompanying nun is decisive for her committing an offence, and just as much the quickness with which she pulls up or lowers her clothes when she crosses a river (II, p.345). Neither aspect is touched either in the Theravāda Vinaya or in the commentary. To judge the quality of the present translation does not come within my scope and will be the task of others. My remarks (below), therefore, are merely proposals with regard to the contents.

As regards the study, Heirman explains that she compared the Bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga of the Dharmaguptakas in all essential points with the Vinayas of the Mahīśāsakas, Mahāsāṃghikas, Sarvāsti-

vādins, Mūlasarvāstivādins and Theravādins. Furthermore, she took into account the Prātimokṣas of various schools. In addition, she discusses the rules for the Dharmaguptaka bhikṣuṇīs in comparison with the rules for monks from the same school, and completes them, if necessary, with material from the Bhikṣuvibhaṅgas of the Chinese and Pāli Vinayas (p.6). This method leads to a plethora of references to comparable rules in other schools, which certainly will be useful for other researchers. As to the description of the life of a nun of a single tradition, however, this method contains the danger of mixing information from other schools and of introducing their interpretations. We would certainly gain a deeper insight into the regulations of the Dharmaguptakas if for the interpretation of the rules the Karmavācānā texts and the Vinaya commentary of this school were consulted. The texts of other schools should only be brought into play thereafter. My comment does not mean that I expected Heirman to fulfil this task in addition to the great labour of translating a long and difficult text as the Bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga. Her 'study' is a welcome introduction to her translation, but a thorough examination, which goes into detail and reaches solutions based on the Dharmaguptaka tradition, will be a future task.

The following are but some remarks:

I, pp.82-8: Heirman discusses the ambiguous phrase *ūnadvādasavassā gihigatā*, 'a married woman less than twelve years old' or 'a woman married for less than twelve years'. She collects information from different Vinayas, from some of the commentaries and from secondary literature, and decides in favour of the meaning 'age'. To find the answer to the question, which of the two interpretations is the one advocated by the Dharmaguptaka tradition, the other traditions, however, are of no great help. A more detailed treatment of the position of the Dharmaguptakas, taking into account the Karmavācānā collections for nuns, would have been preferable. For the Theravāda tradition, this question was examined by U. Hüsken (*op. cit.*, p.55ff.) and Juo-Hsüeh Shih (*op. cit.*, pp.479-503), who both prefer the interpretation as age ('Lebenszeit'), and again taken up by O. von Hinüber who favours 'years of marriage' ('Die Nonnen in Theravāda-Buddhismus. Zu einer weiteren Göttinger Dissertation über das Buddhistische Recht', WZKS, 44, 2000, pp.79-82). In re-examining the relevant Theravāda text I return to the interpretation of age (in my

'Ehe- oder Lebensjahre? Die Altersangabe für eine "verheiratete Frau" (*gihigatā*) in den Rechtstexten der Theravādin', ZDMG, in the press).

I, p.119: In her introduction and throughout the whole book, Heirman writes that the breaking of a Pārājika rule leads to life-long exclusion. Sometimes she adds that the respective person is definitely excluded (II, 315, n.230) which is defined as 'the Saṃgha carries out a *jñapticaturthakarman* for her and dispels her' (II, p.313, n.215). According to the Theravāda Vinaya monks and nuns who commit a Pārājika offence shall be 'excluded' (*nāseti*; Vin I 173,22; II 162,16; III 33,25-31; 40,1-2; IV 216,33). Only in the commentarial tradition are three types of 'exclusion' (*nāsanā*) distinguished, viz. *liṅganāsanā*, *saṃvāsanāsanā* and *daṇḍakamma-nāsanā* (see U.Hüsken, 'The Application of the Vinaya term *nāsanā*', JIABS 20, 2, 1997, pp.93-111; Edith Nolot, 'Studies in Vinaya Technical Terms IV-X', JPTS 25, 1999, pp.58-69). Monks and nuns who commit a Pārājika offence, *liṅganāsanā*, 'exclusion [under retention of the] outward token [of monastic life]', has to be performed (Sp 269,9; 1078,9; Kkh (E 2003) 218,12 [Pār 6 N]). *Liṅganāsanā* is defined in Sp 1014,14-16 with reference to novices as consisting in the cancellation of the three refuges, the choice of preceptor, the reservation of lodgings and the receiving of one's share of the income of the Community. However, the novice keeps his monastic robe and is allowed to remain within the monastery. If he does not persist in his wrong behaviour he can be reordained. *Liṅganāsanā*, therefore, is a loss of monastic status, with exclusion *de jure*, but it is not an expulsion *de facto*. Only if the novice persists in his wrong behaviour is he thrown out (*nikkaḍḍhati*) of the monastery (Nolot, 'Studies IV-X', *op. cit.*, p.58). Since this is the only definition of *liṅganāsanā* in the Sp, we have to suppose that in connection with monks and nuns it has the same meaning, which is confirmed by Sp 269,9-12, where it is applied to bhikkhus as well as samaneras. Hence, it follows that monks and nuns who committed Pārājika offences were allowed to stay in the monastery and to wear their monastic robes. Juo-Hsüeh Shih (*op. cit.*, pp.123-56) examined this question in connection with Pārājika 1 M/N, and mentions this practice *inter alia* as part of the Dharmaguptaka tradition. In a study by Shayne Clarke ('The Existence of the Supposedly Non-existent *śikṣādatta-śrāmaṇerī*. A New Perspective on Pārājika Penance', *Buddhist Studies/Bukkyō Kenkyū*

29, 2000, pp.148-176), it is shown that, at least at the time of the commentarial tradition of the Dharmaguptakas (635 CE), a difference was made between concealed and unconcealed Pārājika offences. In the case of an unconcealed Pārājika offence monks/nuns were excluded from the Community of monks/nuns, but they received 'thirty-five things which they should observe for as long as they live' (*ibid.*, p.150), i.e. they changed their status and remained in the monastery. Clarke shows that this procedure also refers to nuns: only if they re-offend are they expelled from the monastery.

II, p.283, n.61: in discussing the term *paṇḍaka*, Heirman – who prefers 'eunuch' as translation – also quotes Zwilling's statement that the sexual weakness connected with a *paṇḍaka* points to homosexuality. Already O. von Hinüber (*op. cit.*, p.67) and E. Nolot ('Studies IV-X', *op. cit.*, p.65, n.25) rejected this interpretation, but without detailed argumentation. In the Theravāda Vinaya men, women, *paṇḍakas* and hermaphrodites (*ubhayovyañ- janaka*) are listed as sexual partners of monks (Vin III 28,23-28). Each of them is of three kinds: human, non-human, animal. Hence, it follows that the category 'human male' comprises homo- and bi-sexual men. Therefore, there would be no need for the extra category of *paṇḍaka* if this term only referred to homosexuals. As 'man' is used antithetically to 'woman', so *paṇḍaka* is used antithetically to 'hermaphrodite'. Since the hermaphrodite is of two sexes, *paṇḍaka* should therefore be perceived as a person without sex. From the different methods of sexual intercourse practicable with men and *paṇḍakas* (anal and oral) in contrast to those with women and hermaphrodites (vaginal, anal and oral), it only follows that *paṇḍakas* are persons without a vagina, i.e. they are male or neutral. However, in the commentary to the Vinaya, in Samantapāsādikā 1015,32-1016,9, *paṇḍaka* is defined as comprising five different types of *paṇḍaka*: (1) 'a *paṇḍaka* sprinkled [with semen]' (*āsittapaṇḍaka*), (2) 'a *paṇḍaka* on account of jealousy' (*usuyyapaṇḍaka*), (3) 'a *paṇḍaka* by surgery' (*opak-kamikapaṇḍaka*), (4) 'a *paṇḍaka* for a half-month' (*pakkka-paṇḍaka*), and (5) 'a *paṇḍaka* not having the male sex' (*napuṃsakapaṇḍaka* – Skt. *napuṃsaka*; cf. L. P. N. Perera, *Sexuality in Ancient India, A Study Based on the Pali Vinaya-piṭaka*, Colombo 1993, p.137). Out of these the *opakkamikapaṇḍaka* and the *napuṃsakapaṇḍaka* are eunuchs, the other three are only de-



viations from the sexual norm. This shows that, at least in the Theravāda tradition of the fifth century, the term *paṇḍaka* is used in a wider sense than the term 'eunuch' and that it is not used for homosexuals. A consultation of the commentary of the Dharmaguptaka tradition could perhaps help to clarify the position of this school.

II, p.346: The translation 'it is, in accordance with the village that she reaches, a *saṃghāvaśeṣa*' is not intelligible to me. Could it not mean that 'in the very moment she reaches the village, it is a *saṃghāvaśeṣa*'? (cf. also the references given in n.156 [ii, p.407]).

II, p.346: It should be checked whether 'within a village, within one district' does not represent 'a village with one precinct' (Pāli: *gāmo ekūpacāro*) in contrast to 'a village with various precincts' (*gamo nānūpacāro*, Vin III 200,5) or, even better, if it represents *gamūpacāra*. At least in the Theravāda tradition the crossing of the *upacāra* of a not fenced in village with the first step leads to a Thullaccaya offence, with the second to a *Samghādisesa* (Vin IV 230,7-9). Heirman follows a suggestion by Jin-ıl Chung when she writes that 'district (*simā*) most probably coincides with a village (*grāma*)'. I think that 'district' probably renders *upacāra*, since in connection with *Samghādisesa* 3 for nuns, a *gāmūpacāra* is defined as 'enclosure' (*parikkhepa*) in the case of a fenced in village and as 'place for an enclosure' (*parikkhepokāsa*), of a village not fenced in (Sp 1050,17-18; Kkh-pt 33,2-4), *gāmūpacāra* is simultaneously the 'boundary of a village (*gāmasīmā*)'. The question whether this *gāmasīmā* functions as a ceremonial boundary of a Buddhist community or not (II, p.409, n.161) is, however, irrelevant in this case.

II, p.346: Referring to 'If a bhikṣuṇī spends a night alone, it is, in accordance with her flank touching the ground (n.164), a *saṃghāvaśeṣa*', Heirman declares (II, p.409, n.164) 'precise content unclear' and thereafter suggests various explanations. Could not the Chinese original translated here as 'in accordance with' be understood as 'in the very moment'? This would not only fit the text here (she commits a *Samghāvaśeṣa* offence in the very moment in which her flank touches the ground), but also in the examples of a nun reaching a village (cited above).

II, p.963, n.15: The reference '(see note S. 160)' is not specific and I was unable to verify it.

The indices and glossaries, above all those of technical terms, are of great value. As Heirman declares, they have been compiled with the help of the Pāli Vinaya and all the Vinaya texts listed above (p.6). However, the author takes great care to make clear whether a term is proven to be used by the Dharmaguptakas in their Chinese texts or in one of the Sanskrit fragments.

One last remark concerning the book's presentation, which I consider not to be very user-friendly. For practical purposes it would have been agreeable if the rules had been enumerated and if the headings contained not only the designation of the group of offences (*Pārājika*, pp.243-328; *Samghāvaśeṣa*, pp.329-439; *Niḥsargika Pācittika*, pp.441-527, etc.), or, as in the case of the class of *Pācittika* offences, additionally the number of the chapters (1-7) in which the rules are subdivided. To give here the number of each single rule would have been of great help. Another problem is the arrangement of the footnotes: they are placed at the end of each section of offences or, in the case of the *Pācittika* class, at the end of each of the seven subdivisions. If one looks up one footnote with a reference to another footnote one needs at least four fingers to mark the various spots in text and footnote sections, which is very impractical. It is understandable that the length of the footnotes prevents locating them below the text. However, taking into account that the publication is distributed over three volumes, it would have been easy and much more user-friendly to place the footnotes in a separate volume.

Petra Kieffer-Pülz

*Buddhism: Introducing the Buddhist Experience*. Donald W. Mitchell. Oxford University Press, New York 2002. xvi, 368 pp. £16.99. ISBN 0 19 513952 6.

This is an impressive, wide-ranging study of Buddhism, giving solid treatment of the history and the variety of forms of the Buddhist religion. Starting at the beginning, the author presents the Buddha's life and his religious innovation. This is followed by a chapter dealing with the philosophical teachings that span the majority of Buddhist traditions, and further chapters dealing with the Theravāda and Mahāyāna traditions. The remainder of the book presents the development of Buddhism by geographical area: a chapter on Buddhism in India deals with Buddhism's

principal philosophical schools, after which Mitchell presents substantial accounts of the religion's development in Tibet, China, Korea and Japan. Two final chapters deal with modern developments of Buddhism, first in Asia, and second in the West. The text is interspersed with boxes, giving personal testimony from practising Buddhists and sympathisers, adding human interest to the academic content. The book is appropriately illustrated in black and white, and has a glossary of Buddhist terms.

The chapter on Korea is particularly informative, since this material is not well documented in other literature on Buddhism. Mitchell traces its history in the country, identifying its principal schools and discussing developments after the Japanese occupation, which ended in 1945. Fairly solid coverage is given to Won Buddhism – an aniconic form of Korean Buddhism which emerged in the early part of the twentieth century, and growing in size and significance. The new Buddhist movements in Asia deal with a number of social reformers, such as Bhimrao Ambedkar (1891-1956), who endeavoured to improve the lot of Indian untouchables by encouraging them to convert to Buddhism. Less well-known is A.T. Ariyaratne's Sarvodaya Shramadana Movement in Sri Lanka, which pioneered a programme of village renewal, and Buddhadasa Bhikkhu's radical critique of capitalism in Thailand. Thich Nhat Hanh and the Engaged Buddhist movement that emerged from his teachings receive attention, although not in detail.

When dealing with Buddhism in the West, Mitchell tends to focus on diaspora Buddhism, with particular reference to the United States. Although mention is made of Henry Steel Olcott and Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, and how their Theosophical Society helped the revival of Buddhism in the face of British colonialism, there is little substantial reference to the ways in which Buddhism has been espoused by Westerners. In one or two places the author acknowledges the phenomenon, for example in a brief reference to the 'Beat Zen' movement in the US during the 1950s and 1960s, and to Vipassanā. In general, the author does not demonstrate any particular interest in Buddhism's Western uptake. There is no mention, for example, of the Western Buddhist Order or of the New Kadampa Tradition: indeed, Buddhism in Europe does not seem to fall within the book's scope. Although treatment is given to the various modern Nichi-

ren schools, no mention is made of the 1991 split between Nichiren Shoshu in Japan and the predominantly western Soka Gakkai, which until then was the associated lay movement.

It would be unreasonable to expect even as substantial a book as this to cover Buddhism in all its principal forms, and the author deserves to be congratulated for presenting such an impressive, reliable and readable account which deals with Buddhism synchronically as well as diachronically. The book's scope, however, is largely historical and philosophical: there is no reference to folk practices, in which indigenous Buddhists in Asia use the religion to achieve good luck and prosperity. The religion Mitchell presents is still very much 'the religion of reason', which badly needs to be counterbalanced by substantial ethnographical study, such as that carried out by Melford Spiro in his *Buddhism and Society: A Great Tradition and its Burmese Vicissitudes* (New York 1970).

Such a comment, however, indicates the book's methodology rather than any deficiency: Mitchell has chosen a philosophical-historical approach rather than an ethnographical one and, as such, it is an excellent and very thorough survey. The book should be of particular interest to undergraduate students, being a solid and reliable introduction. It could be recommended for a wider audience, including the general reader.

George D. Chryssides  
(University of Wolverhampton)

*Cultural Intersections in Later Chinese Buddhism.* Edited by Marsha Weidner. University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu 2001. ix, 234 pp. US\$44.00. ISBN 0-8248-2308-7.

This edited volume of eight essays on late Chinese Buddhism serves as the second instalment of material either inspired by or derived from a symposium held at the Spencer Art Museum at the University of Kansas in 1994 called 'Latter Days of the Law: Images of Chinese Buddhism 850-1850'. Like the conference volume of the same name (Honolulu 1994), this collection seeks to address the dearth of material in Western languages on post-Tang (618-907) and Song (960-1279) Buddhism in China and, in particular, 'to see post-Tang Buddhism as a force that flowed across social, ethnic, and gender boundaries and fostered the



development of cultural riches comparable to if not greater than those celebrated as the fruit of Confucian social order' (p.3). The comparison with the late Confucian order is both fitting and awkward, given the scope of the contributions to this volume. Teachings, practices and artefacts of material culture associated with the cult of Confucius, and a lengthy list of sages and local worthies, have long been subsumed under the rubric of Confucianism in studies of medieval and late imperial China. This volume presents a similar array of perspectives on the world of Buddhism, focusing on three principal themes: 'Liturgical Culture: Image, Text, and Ritual' (pp.13-72), 'Literati Culture: Calligraphy and Poetry' (pp.73-116) and 'The Political Sphere: Painting, Architecture, and Music' (pp.117-206). These topics engage and challenge the perception of Confucian hegemony over areas of elite and gentry patronage and performance. Several of the essays in this volume, however, exceed this goal and probe the 'tangled reality' of Buddhism on the ground as well (p.9).

The short introduction (pp.1-10) by Marsha Weidner aptly summarises the thrust of the eight essays and weaves them together to provoke the reader to define culture as the connection between them: 'It is possible to speak of the Buddhist cultures of particular locales, monasteries, events, or social groups and of the cultural imperatives of these places, institutions, and people given concrete expression in architecture, images, calligraphy, poetry, and ritual performance' (p.2). The two essays by T. Griffith Foulk and Daniel B. Stevenson comprise the section on Liturgical Culture and make up perhaps the most compelling part of the book. Foulk's essay on 'Religious Functions of Buddhist Art in China' (pp.13-29) is a captivating piece on how objects were used and who used them. Foulk makes an essential distinction between the iconic and aniconic functions of images and states that, 'In Chinese Buddhism, there is a clear sense that such images not only resemble the beings represented, but actually embody or provide a "seat" (*zuo*) for their invisible spirits (*ling*)' (p.14). Foulk proceeds to enumerate eight non-iconic uses for images in Chinese Buddhism. These include decorative, merit-making, as background for texts, repositories for sacred objects, talismanic, meditative or visualisation devices, 'economic', and 'social' (pp.15-20). He then addresses the problems of 'Determining the Historical Usage' (pp.20-7) and 'Religious Meaning' (pp.27-9) for images

and concludes with the powerful statement that, 'the basic problem is that there have never been any absolutely fixed correlations between the appearances (form, style, iconography) of Buddhist images in China and the uses to which they have been put' and 'to ascertain the religious function of a work of Chinese Buddhist art, there is no substitute for observing it in use in its native environment' (p.29). Foulk's remarks form the theoretical basis upon which many of the subsequent chapters dwell.

Stevenson's essay, 'Text, Image, and Transformation in the History of the *Shuilu fahui*, the Buddhist Rite for Deliverance of Creatures of Water and Land' (pp.30-70), not only responds to Foulk's charges in discussing the use of scrolls and ritual objects connected with the *shuilu* rite, but also presents a thorough lesson on the significance of the rite for the late Chinese Buddhist community. Stevenson uses his expertise to guide the reader through an explanation of the purport and function of the rite, detailed descriptions of the ritual manuals used to perform it, and the apocryphal history of the rite and its inception as a seminal aspect of Southern Song (1127-1279) and later Buddhist culture. The essay culminates in an invaluable presentation of the *shuilu* rite and discussion of how the performance of it compelled patrons and actors alike – including the eminent statesman and literatus Su Shi (1037-1101) – to comprehend the Buddhist concepts of retribution and karmic result. Stevenson presents the *shuilu* rite within and outside sectarian and social boundaries, and demonstrates how later Chinese Buddhists utilised the *shuilu* to acquire patronage as a tool to deliver souls from the battlefield and pacify the dead (pp.46-7). In addition, the *shuilu* rite became the focus of internal disputes over 'orthodox' uses of Buddhism (pp.56-7), and represents how Buddhism exerted a resilient and powerful voice within Chinese culture alongside competing cosmologies: 'there is no question that the *shuilu* reproduces symbolic protocols that resonate profoundly with other Chinese ritual venues, such as the Daoist *jiao* or the grand rites of the Tang imperium described in the Kaiyun code' (p.53).

The second section of the volume, on Literati Culture, includes two essays by Amy McNair, on 'Buddhist Literati and Literary Monks: Social and Religious Elements in the Critical Reception of Zhang Jizhi's Calligraphy' (pp.73-86), and Beata Grant, 'Through the Empty Gate: The Poetry of Buddhist Nuns in Late

Imperial China' (pp.87-113). McNair's chapter addresses the changing reception of the Southern Song literatus Zhang Jizhi's (1186-1266) calligraphy – which was undoubtedly inspired by his association with Chan monks and their teachings – by an increasingly anti-Buddhist Neo-Confucian elite and moralising Chinese Buddhist Samgha. Colophons to Zhang's calligraphy – preserved in China and notably in the Japanese Zen temples of Tōfukuji and Daitokuji – underscore how Buddhist influence and art became contested subjects in the wake of Neo-Confucian orthodoxy in the Yuan (1271-1368) and Ming (1368-1644) dynasties. The strength of McNair's essay lies in the subtext of how significant and problematic a subject Buddhism became within literary criticism during the late imperial period in China. Grant's chapter explores – through the medium of poetry – the lives of Buddhist nuns in late imperial China. Grant divides nun-poets into two categories: those who received tonsure based on spiritual motivation and those who entered the convent due to social and economic factors. Grant gives abundant insight into the lives of several nuns and consequently sheds further light on to the reality that Buddhism not only flourished on an institutional basis in post-Tang and Song China, but its teachings and practices provided a vital religious and social alternative within an increasingly misogynistic society. McNair and Grant's essays illustrate several specific ways in which Chinese elite culture was transformed by Buddhism.

The third section on The Political Sphere includes articles by Marsha Weidner on 'Imperial Engagements with Buddhist Art and Architecture: Ming Variations on an Old Theme' (pp.117-44), Patricia Berger, 'Miracles in Nanjing: An Imperial Record of the Fifth Karmapa's Visit to the Chinese Capital' (pp.145-69), Terese Tse Bartholomew on 'Thangkas for the Qianlong Emperor's Seventieth Birthday' (pp.170-88) and Kenneth J. Hammond's 'Beijing's Zhihua Monastery: History and Restoration in China's Capital' (pp.189-207). These four essays engage the question of how the late Chinese imperium used Buddhist institutions, architecture, art and music to project and legitimate itself throughout the provinces. During the Ming and Qing (1644-1912) dynasties, like the infamous Tang beforehand, Buddhism became arguably the most effective tool to propagate the concept of All under Heaven (*tianxia*) within an increasingly multi-ethnic state. Weidner's chapter shows how 'by bestowing buildings, icons,

plaques, steles, and sūtras upon Buddhist monasteries, the court not only accumulated religious merit, but also linked the magnificence of the church and state, giving people remote from the capital glimpses of imperial majesty and building cultural capital on the local level' (p.119). In a statement that implicitly addresses the four essays in this section, Weidner suggests that 'Factors contributing to this kaleidoscopic variation included the personal religious convictions of individual emperors, influence from powerful eunuchs and imperial women, interaction with neighboring Buddhist countries – Tibet, Mongolia, Korea, and Japan – and developments within Chinese religion broadly, notably, increased syncretism and... emphasis on ritual performance' (p. 120). By unifying the symbolic and material worlds of Buddhism, the Ming court literally remapped the Chinese religious landscape in the guise of the Ming imperium.

Both Berger's and Bartholomew's articles address the question of Chinese imperial support for Tibetan Buddhism (*lama jiao*). Berger's essay examines the visit by the Fifth Tibetan Karmapa Dezhin Shegpa (Ch. Helima or Halima, 1384-1415) to Nanjing in 1407, and a set of forty-nine paintings and inscriptions in five languages that commemorate the visit and the ensuing miracles. Berger suggests that the Ming emperor(s) cast themselves in dual roles: one as Chinese emperor for Chinese subjects and one as Buddhist divinity (Mañjuśrī) for non-Chinese patrons. Thus, Ming rulers could simultaneously draw from indigenous Confucian and cosmopolitan Buddhist discourse and presentation to project authority. Bartholomew's essay investigates Qing patronage of Tibetan Buddhism and, like Berger's chapter, demonstrates how the Qing court patronised key Tibetan Buddhist figures – including the Beijing-based Jangya Hutukutus, particularly Rolpay Dorje, and the Sixth Panchen Lama, Lobsang Palden – as part and parcel of addressing non-Chinese subjects. Bartholomew presents three 'birthday' *thangkas* used to commemorate the Sixth Panchen Lama's visit to Beijing on the occasion of the emperor's birthday in 1780. She thoroughly describes the history of Qing patronage for Tibetan Buddhists (pp.170-9) and the iconography of the *thangkas* (pp.179-83).

Hammond discusses the history, layout and political life of Zhihua Chan monastery in Beijing. He describes in detail the monastery grounds (pp.191-7) before elucidating how the monas-



tery was established by the famous and powerful eunuch Wang Zhen (d.1449) in the early 1440s, enjoyed patronage by emperors and wealthy donors, and fell into disrepair during the Qing – because of Zhihua's connections with Wang Zhen – ransacking by foreign troops during the Boxer rebellion in 1901, and support by the Beijing Buddhist Music Association under the People's Republic government (pp.201-2). Hammond's essay provides an intriguing conclusion to this volume because he addresses the life of a particular site with a rich heritage that endured institutional, social and economic transformations in an epoch of monumental change for Chinese Buddhism. Unfortunately, he provides only piecemeal discussion of the famous Buddhist music of Zhihua monastery (p.202); this lacuna is perhaps most notable because in a volume on Buddhist culture and art, music is largely ignored.

The book is splendidly produced, with a full glossary and character list. Footnotes, rather than endnotes, and embedded Sinitic logographs would have provided the reader with much easier access to the wealth of research by the talented contributors.

George A. Keyworth  
(University of Colorado)

*Hōnen's Senchakushū: Passages on the Selection of the Nembutsu in the Original Vow* (Senchaku hongon nembutsu shū). University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu 1998, xiii, 280 pp. Hb \$55.00, ISBN 0-8248-2025-8; pb \$29.95, ISBN 0-8248-2110-6.

The translation of Hōnen (Genkū, 1133-1212)'s magnum opus *Senchakushū* (also called *Senjakushū*, 1198 or 1204) by the *Senchakushū* English Translation Project of Taishō University is a most welcome addition to the comparatively sparse scholarship in English on Hōnen and his thought. Hōnen and his Pure Land school (Jōdo shū) have often seemed, particularly in English language scholarship, to be eclipsed by his slightly better-known and more thoroughly studied successor, Shinran (1173-1262), founder of the True Pure Land school (Jōdo shinshū). Students and scholars of Buddhism have often viewed Hōnen's thought as a developmental stage in the evolution of what was to become Shinran's unique form of Pure Land Buddhism, while ignoring the

distinctiveness of Hōnen's own thought, and the marked differences between his and that of his disciple.

While *Senchakushū* is by no means an overwhelmingly long work, it is dense in terms of the complexity of Hōnen's thought and his interpretation of the Pure Land sūtras to justify his advocacy of reliance on the 'original vow' (*hongan*) of Amida Buddha and the practice of the *nembutsu* – that is, according to Hōnen, the recitation of the name of Amida. Fortunately, along with a skilled translation of the original text, the Taishō University team has provided an outstanding, thorough introduction which includes details on the life of Hōnen, the religious and historical climate of the early Kamakura period, and the history and contents of the three Pure Land sūtras (*Jōdo sanbukyō*). It further discusses several features characteristic of medieval Japanese Buddhism, such as 'classification of the teachings' (*kyōhan*) and the importance of establishing a proper lineage, in its presentation of how Hōnen addressed these issues in his efforts to establish his Pure Land school. On these points in particular, the inclusion of a summary of Jōkei (Gedatsubō, 1155-1213)'s 'Kōfukuji Petition' (*Kōfukuji sōjō*) is helpful, although its primary purpose in the introduction, the authors indicate, is to provide the reader with a description of the 'foundation for the persecution that Hōnen and his community of followers endured'. (We fortunately have an introduction and translation – and perhaps different perspective – of the entire petition in Robert Morrell's *Early Kamakura Buddhism: A Minority Report*, Berkeley 1987.)

In particular, the introduction is useful for its careful presentation of Hōnen's stance on the roles of various practices outside of the *nembutsu* and faith in Amida. This clarification is important and much-needed because it allows the reader to distinguish between Hōnen's own views and those of Shinran – a distinction that is often neglected and which has led in the past to the 'lumping together' of the two figures under the simple rubric of '*nembutsu* advocates'. For example, as is pointed out on p.38, while Shinran rejected all practices outside of absolute surrender to Amida, Hōnen admits a place for the manifold practices of the 'Holy Path' (*shōdōmon*) once the practitioner has come to rely on the saving grace of Amida. One note on the otherwise satisfactory translation here: while the authors have chosen the term 'Holy Path' for the term *shōdōmon*, I would suggest that the terms

'Saintly Way' or 'Sagely Way' are perhaps preferable, as the latter suggest the self-power (*jiriki*)-centred practices that both Hōnen and his successor reacted against, while the former has a connotation of being at least as appropriate as the Pure Land way. This is perhaps more a question of semantics than a strict translation issue, but the use of more accurate terminology to reflect Hōnen's stance may make it easier to understand the argument presented in *Senchakushū*.

The introduction concludes with a short reference to the medieval practice of *kanjin shaku* – 'an interpretation of scripture grounded not in the letter of the text but in personal religious insight' (p.46) – in which not only Hōnen, but that other much-praised thinker, Eihei Dōgen, engaged. This is a brief but important point which I was particularly glad to see included as a reminder to the reader who might otherwise delight in finding loopholes in Hōnen's 'logic'. Finally, just ahead of the translation proper is included a synopsis of the contents of the various chapters of the *Senchakushū*. These summaries introduce concisely the argument Hōnen makes in each chapter and the textual sources on which he bases them.

While the work's title is *Senchakushū* and the translation most satisfactory, *Hōnen's Senchakushū: Passages on the Selection of the Nenbutsu in the Original Vow* (*Senchaku hongon nenbutsu shū*), with its long and detailed introduction, summaries and translation of the original text, and abundant and informative glossary, is in fact a thorough study of Hōnen in its own right. It is a work that is useful and appropriate for both the student and the specialist who wish to know more about this important figure of medieval Japanese Buddhism, and for all who wish to come to a clearer understanding of Hōnen's unique interpretation of Pure Land Buddhism.

Michael J. Dankert  
(Kansai Gaidai University, Osaka)

*Re-Visioning "Kamakura" Buddhism*. Edited by Richard K. Payne. (Kuroda Institute Studies in East Asian Buddhism No.11), University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu 1998. vii, 280 pp. Pb, \$24.95. ISBN 0-8248-2078-9; (Hb. \$50.00 – ISBN not known).

This important collection of studies which 're-vision' Kamakura

Buddhism, though it has now been available for some time, remains essential to an understanding of how current scholarship assesses and continues to assess Japanese Buddhism in the Kamakura period. (1192-1333). The book starts on the premise – well-documented in many studies by now, yet still vitally important to continue emphasising – that the idea of 'Kamakura' Buddhism as the Pure land, Zen and Nichiren schools that arose during this dynamic time are by no means wholly representative of the Buddhism of the Kamakura period. These schools, which have in past decades been synonymous with the term 'Kamakura Buddhism', should be more accurately termed 'Kamakura *new* Buddhism', as the major schools inherited from the previous period – the Tendai and Shingon schools, for example – not only remained in the Kamakura and later eras, but were in fact the dominant forms of Buddhism for much of the medieval period.

Richard Payne's introduction and the following chapter, James Dobbins' 'Envisioning Kamakura Buddhism', present very clearly and concisely where the study of Kamakura Buddhism has been, where it is and where it has the potential to go. Payne addresses the major problems of the 'Reformation Model' of Kamakura Buddhism – that model which compares the new developments in Kamakura Buddhism to those of the European Christian Reformation – in his introduction with succinct subheadings such as 'The Rhetoric of Decadence', 'The Rhetoric of Novelty' and 'Beyond "Shintō" and Buddhism' that present the problem with lucidity and accuracy. Dobbins, for his part, offers the 'cultic center model', presenting both its advantages and potential pitfalls, as an alternative to other models in the study of medieval Japanese Buddhism, including the latter's division into categories of 'old' and 'new', as well as the socio-economic-political *kenmitsu-taisei* (exoteric-esoteric) model of Kuroda Toshio, which is perhaps the ascendant model among scholars of Japanese Buddhism today, and, it might be added, a strong influence on many of the chapters of *Re-Visioning "Kamakura" Buddhism*.

Further chapters include George Tanabe Jr.'s study of the rise of popular Shingon during the Kamakura period, and Alan Graphard's inquiry into the Tendai Shintō-Buddhist syncretism and esotericism (*taimitsu*) of Mount Hiei. Both these studies remind us that, far from being in a state of decline or philosophically and religiously vacuous, both of these 'old' schools were



still practically and ideologically vibrant in the medieval period. Robert Morrell's and James Foard's studies of the vital importance of literature and its unique role in presenting the actual state of Buddhism during the Kamakura offer perspectives that should always be (though unfortunately rarely are) taken into account in the study of medieval religion in Japan. Morrell's authority in particular comes from his having been a pioneer in the study of medieval Buddhism in the literary tradition now for decades, and the title of Foard's contribution, 'What One Kamakura Story Does', minces no words in emphasising the importance of literature to the study of Buddhism. This is a field that remains very fertile ground for gaining insight into Japanese Buddhism as it was actually perceived and received in the Kamakura period. Jacqueline Stone's lengthy chapter on the history of chanting the title of the *Lotus Sūtra* (*daimoku*) deserves special attention, as it provides an in-depth presentation of the history of this practice before Nichiren took it up as his recommended sole-practice (*senju*), and deals in particular with the sticky problem of the authorship and date of the *Shuzenji-ketsu*, an apocryphal work attributed to Saichō (767-822) (p.118) recommending recitation of the *Lotus*' title. Stone also addresses the important and, as of yet, debated question of whether Nichiren was influenced by or he himself influenced the content of this work. Mark Unno's presentation of Myōe (1173-1232)'s *kōmyō shingon* and finally Richard Payne's exploration of *ajikan* practice, both relating to the Shingon tradition in medieval Japanese Buddhism, provide a new awareness of and insights into these lesser-studied companions to the *nenbutsu* and *daimoku* practices of the Pure Land and Nichiren schools.

*Re-Visioning "Kamakura" Buddhism*, part of the Kuroda Institute Studies in East Asian Buddhism series, might well itself have been the first in a series of works in a similar vein since, as this collection demonstrates (particularly in its study of the role of *practice*), there are many, many aspects of Kamakura Buddhism that have yet to be explored to provide us with a more accurate, fully-rounded view of Japanese Buddhism in this important age. We must, of course, take heed of the caveats Dobbins presents regarding the dangers of becoming too specialised with such approaches as the Cultic Center model. Nevertheless, it seems that further studies of this sort are both necessary and inevitable.

Fortunately, we do have a continuation of this kind of approach in other books in the Kuroda Institute series, and in George Tanabe Jr., ed. *Religions of Japan in Practice* (Princeton Univ. Press 1999), where many works from the same distinguished scholars who have contributed to *Re-Visioning "Kamakura" Buddhism* appear. Though one reviewer, while rightfully praising this collection for its important contributions, has expressed regret that it did not appear some years earlier, before most Buddhist studies scholarship had already embraced many of its central arguments, I see the work as yet being both timely and relevant. The fact remains that decades of scholarship reflecting the 'Reformation Model', while in many ways still valuable in its own right, fill the shelves of our university libraries, and these shelves are precisely where the average university student in search of information about Japanese Buddhism gets their information, most often from the well-known but now somewhat outdated historical overviews. Sections of *Re-Visioning "Kamakura" Buddhism* are required reading for my own students, and the book in its entirety is required reading for anyone who wants a more detailed look at specific aspects – and at the same time a more accurate presentation – of Buddhism as it actually existed in the Kamakura period.

Michael J. Dankert  
(Kansai Gaidai University, Osaka)

*Opening a Mountain: Kōans of the Zen Masters*. Steven Heine. Oxford University Press, New York and Oxford 2001. xiv, 200 pp. £18.99. ISBN 019 513 586 5.

There appears to be no Western academic who devotes more explicit attention to the study of kōans (*gongan*) and kōan literature than Steven Heine. *Opening a Mountain: Kōans of the Zen Masters* is a short translation volume with sixty kōan cases from Chinese and Japanese sources, coupled with a brief but insightful introduction that aspires to present these kōans as evidence of the thaumaturgical traditions within Chan and Zen Buddhism. Previously, students and practitioners of Chinese Chan, Korean Sōn and Japanese Zen have only had access to this expression of the function of kōan literature in English through the innovative scholarly work of Bernard Faure, T. Griffith Foulk,

John McRae and Robert Sharf. In this volume, Heine promptly introduces the reader to the localised cultural context within which kōans became effective tools in rhetorical debates between Chan/Zen masters and Taoists, as well as indigenous elite and popular religious specialists. Following William Powell's research on the significance of mountains in Chinese Chan, Heine aspires to 'demonstrate that the main theme underlying much of kōan literature deals with how Zen (Ch'an in Chinese) masters opened or transformed mountains' because 'mountains harbored spirits, demons, and bodhisattvas, as well as hermits, ascetics, and other irregular practitioners, and were opened through the use of symbols and rituals of spiritual significance' (p.xiii). Heine is only partially successful in presenting his case. Mountains do indeed figure prominently in the narratives of kōan discourse, however they are only one significant part of the cultural-religious landscape caught up in the struggles for patronage by medieval Chinese Chan and Japanese Zen advocates. In spite of the fact that Heine's approach is innovative, his presentation forms a perplexing labyrinth of historical and theoretical discussion necessitating a *thorough* background on kōan scholarship in the West.

The kōan translations are arranged in topical fashion and by chapter: '1. Surveying a Mountain Landscape' (pp.37-72), '2. Contesting with Irregular Rivals' (pp.73-100), '3. Encountering Supernatural Forces' (pp.101-40), '4. Wielding Symbols of Authority' (pp.141-68), '5. Confessional Experiences: Giving Life and Controlling Death' (pp.169-96). Each chapter is further subdivided into both conventional Zen categories and pithy themes. In Chapter One the reader meets kōan cases about the Northern, Ox-Head and Southern lineages of early Chan, Master Dongshan, and Mount Wutai. Chapter Two relates cases pertaining to recluses, wonder-workers and engendered bodies. In Chapters Three and Five we become acquainted with kōans about 'Trances, Visions, and Dreams' (pp.103-13), 'Spirits, Gods, and Bodhisattvas' (pp.114-26), 'Magical Animals' (pp.127-40), 'Repentance and Self-Mutilation' (pp.171-83), and 'Death, Relics, and Ghosts' (pp.184-96). Heine groups kōans about religious icons and authority in Chapter Four.

The reader must turn to the 'Introduction: What are Kōans?' (pp.1-35) for guidance on how to approach the kōan selections and for Heine's astute discussion about the 'rich component of

mythological and marvelous elements that pervade this genre of literature in a way that complements, rather than contradicts, the demythological or iconoclastic perspective' (p.xiii). If one can ignore a few erroneous claims about the historical description of the development of Chan Buddhism in China, then the Introduction forms both a perceptive manual on how to correct misunderstandings about kōan literature and an astute discussion of contemporary scholarly attitudes on the function of that literature. The first section of the Introduction – 'Sticks and Stones, but It's No-Names that Hurt' (pp.1-12) – sketches the controversy Heine wishes to engage with broad strokes. He begins by defining the kōan as 'a brief, enigmatic anecdote or dialogue between two contesting parties'. He characteristically adds that most Zen kōans can be dated to the 'golden age' of Zen during the Tang dynasty (618-907), and that they 'capture the dramatic and inscrutable encounters between masters and disciples or rivals' (p.1). Immediately Heine places kōan narrative structure within the discourse of both the Buddhist ascetic tradition (*dhutagūṇa*) and Avadāna literature, which often emphasises the six supernatural powers (*abhijñā, shentong*) of the Buddha. Heine underscores the fact that these attributes of Indian and Central Asian Buddhism were especially appreciated by the Chinese populace who were familiar with 'pre-Buddhist shamanic techniques of purification and exorcism, Taoist folklore about mountain and other local deities, and generic popular texts on the efficacy of exorcism or turning the power of ghosts and spirits from malevolence to moral purposes' (pp.2-3). After noting the significance of the 'Biographies of Eminent Monks' collection (*Gaoseng zhuan*) and sectarian Chinese Chan 'Record of the Transmission of the Lamp from the Jingde Era [1004]' (*Jingde chuandeng lu*) as evidence of the marvellous in Chinese Buddhism, Heine moves to critique the 'conventional' perception of kōans (p.4). Therein he suggests a second definition of kōans: 'kōans are rhetorical devices that use paradox, wordplay, and ambiguity to communicate a message about the maddening quality and inherent limitations of language' (p.6). We encounter another set of correctives to the reader's impression of kōans when Heine suggests that, in addition to the legal and political context of kōans, esoteric Buddhism also had a profound influence upon kōan literature: 'Kōan discourse also relies on the modalities of esoteric Buddhist training that is



characterized by intense subjectivity... as well as an aura of secrecy and inscrutability to outsiders' (p.8). Here, as in many sections of the Introduction and subsequent translated material, the non-specialist reader would benefit from a short definition of esoteric Buddhism (or Taoism, shamanism, and so forth) the better to comprehend the significance of the author's assertions.

In the subsection on 'The Mythological Background of Kōan Literature' (pp.13-20) we see Heine's most substantive critique of traditional modes of reading kōans. He contradicts his earlier teleological fallacy regarding the formation of kōan literature during the Tang 'golden age' when he states that these encounters were 'originally contained in mythological narratives included in the transmission of the lamp records', which date to the Song dynasty (960-1279) (p.13). Not only does Heine correct himself but he also points out that the transmission of the lamp texts (*denglu*) – as well as kōan collections – were intimately influenced by 'non-denominational monk biography texts' and 'non-Buddhist folklore collections, including the *T'ai p'ing kuang-chi* [*Tai ping guangji*] (978)' (pp.15-16). Heine then utilises the theoretical models of Jacques LeGoff and Michael Foucault to suggest that the Chan production of hagiographical literature during the Song – including both the transmission of the lamp and recorded sayings (*yulu*, *goroku*) genres – constructed encounter dialogues designed to contend with the diffuse environment of Chinese religion (pp.17-19). Heine eventually leads the reader back to the mountainsides of China in order to illustrate how mountain landscapes represent fertile ground upon which Chan masters transcend and reconstitute the traditional Chinese religious themes of pilgrimage, seclusion and the boundaries of the sacred and the vulgar (pp.20-5). Heine also provides definite directions on how to read kōans and explains how he chose to elide selected commentaries and add his own 'discussion' – or sub-commentary – to each kōan cited (pp.30-3).

The translations of the sixty kōans are largely accurate, however, given the depth of discussion in the Introduction, Heine's sub-commentary lacks sufficient citations of indigenous Chinese sources. Instead, we find a good deal of discussion relating to Japanese commentaries – especially related to Dōgen (1200-53) – when Japanese context is missing from the Introduction. And, as mentioned before, he neglects to translate large

sections of each case, opting instead to paraphrase part of the remaining material. This detail renders Heine's translations helpful for general reference to kōans rather than this volume being a new source to turn to for translated kōans. It is also curious to see that the reader finds little evidence of points raised in the individual chapter introductions mentioned in the corresponding kōan cases. For example, in Chapter Five, we are presented with the bodhisattva vows and Taoist immortals (pp.170-1), but the supporting kōans do not raise these issues directly. Moreover, in the discussion to kōan No.55 'Dōgen's Disciples: Monk Gemmyō' (pp.182-4), Heine pertinently mentions the Daruma-shū influence on Dōgen's nascent Sōtō Zen sect, but provides little context for the non-specialist reader. Heine also unmistakably utilises many Japanese – especially Sōtō – Zen materials to present the translations but provides inadequate context or explanation for these choices.

Steven Heine should be commended for his effort to engage the issue of thaumaturgy and the ways in which Chan/Zen masters confronted indigenous religious traditions and practices in *Opening a Mountain: Kōans of the Zen Masters*. Unfortunately, without a glossary, Sino-Japanese character list or bibliography, the target audience is likely to be non-specialist readers without sufficient background to appreciate the nuanced portrayal of these kōans. As in many volumes that use the Wade-Giles system, Heine provides mistaken romanisation for Chinese terms including opening a mountain as '*kuai-shan*', where *kai-shan* would be correct (p.26). I have not checked every page reference to the original source material; however, Case 6: 'Kuei-shan Kicks Over the Water Pitcher' (pp.48-51), from the *Wumen guan*, should give Taishō page 298a instead of 296a. In addition, it is regrettable to see the Wade-Giles system of romanisation for Chinese used instead of the now almost universally accepted Pinyin system; this fact alone is likely to deter instructors from using *Opening a Mountain: Kōans of the Zen Masters* in a classroom setting.

George A. Keyworth  
(University of Colorado)

*Ehe und Mystik in Ost und West.* Hellmuth Hecker. Verlag Beyerlein & Steinschulte, Stammnach-Herrnschrot 2002. 289 pp. Pb. ISBN 3-931095-41-X

The author of this book should be well-known to readers of this journal from the reviews of his writings which have involved the Buddhist scene, but he has also done some research into mysticism, often on a comparative basis, about which he has written short books which have not been reviewed here. Since half of the present publication is based on Pāli Buddhist sources, it certainly deserves our attention.

The theme is interesting, because in most traditions higher spiritual achievements presuppose the overcoming of the sexual drive and in some of them, for example in the early Buddhist one, even emotional attachments are regarded as hindrances on the path to sanctity or deliverance. There is, of course, Tantrism, which insists on the importance of polarity and outlines the methodology for the integration of even its sexual variety into the liberating practice, either symbolically or in full carnal execution, although marriage is not usually envisaged as its concomitant. But the Tantric path remains something of a controversial issue and most traditional approaches regard it more or less as a deviation and an unrealistic wish-fulfilling delusion along the lines of the proverb 'to have one's cake and eat it'.

When an earnest seeker of spiritual fulfilment becomes a monk, a recluse or a wandering ascetic, his path is clear. But what about the less rigorously committed lay followers of a strict tradition who stay in the world and lead their lives in the context of a family? The author may have gained insight into this question not just from his studies of sources, but also as a committed follower of the Pāli tradition from his own experience, having lived singly into his advanced years and marrying only after the death of his aged mother who had been looking after him.

The book comprises four collections of stories, the first and longest describing seventeen Buddhist married couples' lives as they could be put together from the sparse references in the discourses in the Sutta-pitaka, supplemented by more explicit information gleaned from the Commentaries. Most of these couples are designated as having eventually reached stream-entry, the first stage of sanctity on the way to Nibbāna, securing its attainment not later than after seven more incarnations. The author does not

fail to indicate that, from the vantage point of the early Buddhist tradition, even this initial achievement surpasses any mystical accomplishment. Thereby he touches upon a point implied in many Pāli suttas, particularly the Brahmajālasutta (DN I, 1), which regard as virtually spiritual *culs-de-sac*, however uplifting, any views and beliefs outside the scope of the Buddhist outlook which is based on the practice of the Eightfold Path.

The first marriage to be described is that of Anāthapiṇḍika, a rich banker and generous supporter of the Buddha's community of monks for whom he built the monastic abode in Jetavana. His first meeting with the Buddha and his achievement of stream-entry during it is vividly described, although for other details of his life the author refers the reader to his article in the magazine *Wissel und Wandel* 1967 to which not everybody will have access. However, brief life stories of his four children are told, including that of his third daughter who addressed him, before she died, as 'younger brother', having reached the second stage of sanctity, that of the 'once-returner'. The puzzled father was later informed by the Buddha as to the reason for her seeming impertinence. When he died, he met her in Tuṣita heaven (where she was spending her last life before liberation) and he then appeared to the Buddha to tell him about it. At least one other married pair has to be mentioned, namely Nakulapitā and Nakulamātā who, on first seeing the Buddha, recognised him as their son in many previous lives. They then reached stream-entry on the spot. Some of the stories have a dramatic element when, to begin with, one of the partners is spiritually advanced while the other one is deep in ignorance and then all ends happily, often accompanied by miraculous events. All the stories make for a good relaxing read. What transpires from them in terms of doctrine is that some stages of sanctity on the path can be achieved while marital life continues or that the prior attainment of stream-entry does not preclude entering into marriage and have a family. The highest achievement of arahatship is of course above polarity.

The second collection gives the stories of six mystics from Protestant and non-conformist circles, the most famous among them being Jakob Böhme and William Blake. Böhme had a yearning for redemption from early years, but felt that its prospect was obscured by theologians. As a shoemaker apprentice he had a mystical experience which might have pointed him to a secluded



monastic life had he been a Roman Catholic, but eventually the inner spiritual drive burst into the open even in his situation as a married burgher. He had an experience of a 'central vision' into the nature of reality and saw other planes of existence both higher and lower than the material one. His attitude to sex is reflected in his concept of the original androgenic spiritual existence of man in the astral world. His fall into the material world was a result of the feminine splitting away from him and obtaining a separate existence. This reinterpretation of the Bible story of the fall is perhaps an echo of his studies of ancient Greek thought. The author tries to fit Böhme's and other figures' experiences, which he describes, into the Buddhist scheme in the spirit of the early sources as indicated above.

Most readers may not have heard of the other mystics in this and even in the third collection, which is dedicated to fifteen married Roman Catholic mystics, but their stories are fascinating. They were mostly women and often had no say over being given away in marriage, although some eventually won their husbands round to the idea of living without sexual contact, for example in one marriage after eight of nine children had died.

The most interesting part of the book is the fourth one, about ten spiritual friendships which clearly involved no carnal contacts, but polarity and a sense of its integration in the course of spiritual progress does seem to lurk in the background. Two of the pairs of mystics related are widely known: Francis and Clara of Assisi and Saint John of the Cross and Theresa of Avila. In the writings of the latter pair one can find many parallels to Buddhist descriptions of spiritual experiences, including *jhānas* and elements of insight into the nature of reality, and visions of non-material planes of existence. Even *iddhis*, known from Pāli sources as accessible to achievers of *jhānas*, are described; readers familiar with St Theresa's autobiography will be aware of this. One particularly evocative incident is when Sister Beatrix in St Theresa's monastery, which gave refuge to St John when he escaped from prison, witnessed them both levitating after a discourse about the Trinity which brought them both into an ecstatic state.

Although the book is written for the general public in an easy style, there is a wealth of research behind it as one can gauge from the Bibliography of sources.

Karel Werner (SOAS)

*Der Buddha sprach nicht nur für Mönche und Nonnen.* Die ganze Lehre erstmals nur nach seinen Reden für Nichtasketen, 2, vollständig überarbeitete Auflage. Fritz Schäfer. Werner Kristkeitz Verlag, Heidelberg-Leimen 2002. 880 pp. ISBN 3 921508 80 0.

In my review (*BSR* 17, 1, 2000) of the first edition of this book (published in 1995) I mentioned that a revised edition was to be published later in the year. In the event it took another two years for it to appear. It is a remarkable achievement considering the length of the work, which obviously did not deter readers interested in the practice of Buddhist principles while living in the world. The usefulness of the book for study purposes has been greatly enhanced by the new Index. The text in some passages has been reformulated and two sections have been completely rewritten. One deals with the problem of worldly possessions and with experiencing satisfactions in life. These, as *Aṅguttara-nikāya* IV, 61 shows, can be acquired through diligence by lawful means and need not be obstacles on the way if, intent on salvation, one does not pursue them blindly but preserves one's confidence in the Buddha's teaching, practising virtue, generosity and clear understanding of karmic consequences.

The other section, the last of the book, concerns the *anusāri*, the follower who is 'definitely safe' in his confidence and reaches *sotāpatti* at death, if not earlier. The book finishes with a quotation from a letter by a simple *Hausfrau* with only basic education who summarises the whole teaching in one paragraph which does not seem to need anything added to it. The practice is expressed in one sentence: 'We should simply distance ourselves a bit, grasp less and not allow the goal to slip away from our sight'.

Karel Werner (SOAS)

*Traveller in Space. Gender, Identity and Tibetan Buddhism* (revised edition). June Campbell. Continuum, London & New York 2002. Pb, 236 pp. £12.99. ISBN 0 8264 5719 3.

The revised edition of June Campbell's controversial work does little to answer its initial critics. Bound by the constraints of Freudian theory, it cannot hope to achieve a methodological footing which is adequate to its ambitious project: a cultural criticism of the engendered power structures inherent in traditional Tibetan Buddhism. Freudian theory has suffered a dual fate in its

encounter with feminism; on the one hand, it has been rejected as dependent on a patrilineal nuclear family model, and thus unable to envision or analyse any other (or better!) social order (on which see S. Firestone, *The Dialectic of Sex*, New York 2002); on the other hand, it has been the target of various strategies of co-optation and subversion by French feminists of the so-called 'Second Wave' such as Irigary and Cixious. Campbell's work seems unaware of this distinction and blithely proceeds to attempt a highly critical, even shrill, assault on Tibetan religious sex/power complexes without really addressing the fundamental question of how a theory which is so beholden to the social and gender structures of one culture can be used to regard those of another's. The incongruity of this theoretical fit occasionally juts out in the text, such as when she claims that 'the key players in the Oedipal triangle – mother, father, child – have been historically shared (*knowingly or not*) by people of all cultures' (p.80, *italics mine*).

In the years since this book's initial publication, more mature works have been published which consider the same traditions Campbell has described. E. English's recent work (*Vajrayogini*, Boston 2002) draws on a thorough knowledge of the textual sources to show that there was a strong independent cult of Vajrayogini, visualised without reference to any male deity. This precisely disproves Campbell's thesis that there is no tradition of independent female deities. Isabelle Onians has begun to publish her research on the history of the sexual act within Buddhist tantra, a study which shows that there were explicit homosexual features to the secret initiations and very possibly a separate female lineage. I might also note J. Gyatso's study (*Apparitions of the Self, The secret autobiographies of a Tibetan visionary*, Princeton 1998) of the interior voice of the *ḍākinī* within a male consciousness, the omission of which from Campbell's work is curious.

Clearly, by attempting to bring rigorous theory to bear on the historical study of the Tibetan traditions, Campbell's book was a valuable contribution to the field. Insofar as it attempted a genuinely engaged cultural criticism, which I believe was constructive in its original intent, her work shows a courage which sadly overshoots its actual competence. As a landmark in the history of a developing discipline, then, *Traveller in Space* has its place, though this may not justify a fresh edition.

Will Tuladhar-Douglas (Wolfson College, Oxford)

We welcome contributions to this journal in any aspect of the field of Buddhist studies.

All Mss should be sent to the Editor or the US representative at the addresses given below in (2). Copyright will automatically be vested in this journal unless a contributor stipulates otherwise.

\* \* \* \* \*

### Annual Subscription

(1) UKABS Membership (including subscription to BSR): £15  
(unwaged £10)

by cheque made payable to 'UK Association for Buddhist Studies' to be sent to:

Dr Elizabeth Harris, UKABS Treasurer, 33 Buck Lane, London NW9 0AP – England

OR

BSR (journal only): Individual : £10.00 / US\$ 14.00  
Joint or institutional : £15.00 / US\$ 21.00

Sterling payment by Iban to A/C No.GB89GIRB72000526134003, direct bank transfer citing BIC No. GIRBGB22 or cheque drawn on a UK-based bank (Eurocheques **not** acceptable), made payable to 'Buddhist Studies Review' to be sent to:

(2) Russell Webb (Editor BSR), 31 Russell Chambers, Bury Place, London WC1A 2JX – England  
(e-mail: buddhiststudiesreview@btinternet.com)

Or, for NORTH AMERICA – payments in US\$:

Prof. Charles S. Prebish (US Representative BSR), The Pennsylvania State University, Religious Studies Program, 108 Weaver Building, University Park, PA 16802-5500, USA.

\* \* \* \* \*

The address of the Institut de recherche bouddhique Linh-Sơn is: Tùng Lâm Linh-Sơn International, Dhamma Ville, Hameau des Bosnages – Rancon, F-87290 Chateauponsac, France.